JPRS-TAC-86-028

27 MARCH 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-028

27 March 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. SDI Chief Says Real Weapons Soon To Be Produced
(L. Koryavin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 8 Mar 86)................. 1

TASS Reports Conference on SDI Issue Held in U.S.
(Moscow TASS, 9 Mar 86).................................. 2

USSR: UK Bars Pentagon 'Consultants' From SDI Firms
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 9 Mar 86)........................ 3

TASS: Abrahamson Outlines SDI Research Programs
(Moscow TASS, 8 Mar 86).................................. 4

USSR Deplores Italian Accession to SDI
(Various sources, various dates).......................... 5

'Unable To Stand Its Ground', by Nikolay Prozhogin 5
U.S. Pressure Continues 6
Italian Delegation's Talks in U.S. 6

Soviet Scientist Continues Assessment of SDI Weaknesses
(Boris Rauschenbach; Moscow in English to North America,
6 Mar 86).. 8

Soviet Academician Counters SDI Justifications
(Moscow TASS, 10 Mar 86)................................. 11

Italian Government Agrees to Industry's SDI Participation
(Rome International Service, 8 Mar 86).................... 12

Belgian Report on Possible European Space Defense
(Brussels KNACK, 22 Jan 86).............................. 13

Polish Press Reports FRG CDU Stand on SDI Program
(Ryszard Drecki; Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU, 28 Nov 85).......... 15

SDI-ASAT Controversies, Vulnerabilities Examined in Press
(Tadeusz Pioro; Warsaw POLITYKA, 12 Oct 85)................ 16

Poles Quote Abrahamson on SDI Research Progress
(Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY, 28 Nov 85)......................... 20

Canadian Fear of Possible Territory Use for SDI Discussed
(Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 24, 25 Feb 86)................ 21

Arms Control, Scientists Groups, by Jeff Sallot 21
External Affairs Minister's Response 22

Takeiri Holds SDI Talks With Weinberger
(Tokyo KYODO, 12 Mar 86)................................... 23

Japan To Send Third Fact-Finding SDI Mission to U.S.
(Tokyo KYODO, 4 Mar 86).................................... 25

Japan Ministry Official Urges Caution in SDI Decision
(Tokyo KYODO, 5 Mar 86).................................... 26

Briefs

Weinberger Asks Japan To Join Program 27
TASS on U.S. ABM Test Facility 27
SPD Urges FRG To 'Renounce' SDI 27
Envoy Opposes SDI Facility Use 27

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: FRG Sings 'From U.S. Score' in Reply to Soviet Proposal
(Moscow Domestic Service, 22 Feb 86)....................... 28

USSR: U.S. Continues Opposing Arms Control Measures
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 8 Mar 86)......................... 30

PRAVDA Notes Media Criticism of U.S. Reply on Arms
(Moscow PRAVDA, 26 Feb 86)................................. 34

TASS Cites Senator Kennedy on Arms Agreements
(Moscow TASS, 19 Feb 86)................................... 35

USSR 'Top Priority' on Gorbachev CPSU Speech, U.S. Reaction
(Moscow in English to North America, 27 Feb 86)............ 37

CPSU Congress Reaffirms USSR Commitment to Disarmament
(Georgiy Sturua; Moscow in English to North America,
7 Mar 86).. 42

USSR's Karpov Interviewed on Prospects for Geneva Talks
(V.P. Karpov Interview; Moscow Television Service, 6 Mar 86) 44

Tower Resignation From Geneva Delegation Noted by TASS
(Moscow TASS International Service, 12 Mar 86) 45

CPSU Security Policy Combats 'Nuclear Madness'
(V. Yeshchenko; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 11 Mar 86) 46

PRAVDA Observer Ovchinnikov Views Security Issues, Process
(Vsevolod Ovchinnikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 11 Mar 86) 50

PRAVDA Reviews Petrovskiy Book on Nuclear War, Arms Control
(Moscow PRAVDA, 16 Feb 86) 54

USSR Literary Paper on Problems of Security, Peace
(Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 5 Mar 86) 56

USSR's Zagladin Cites U.S. 'Obstacles' at Arms Talks
(Paris AFP, 8 Mar 86) 60

Italian Defense Official Comments on Gorbachev Speech
(Rome AVANTI!, 1 Mar 86) 61

U.S.-Western Responses to Gorbachev's Proposal Weighed
(Editorial, Peter Sereny; Budapest NEPSZABADSAG, 3 Feb 86) 63

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR Notes U.S. Resolution Calling for U.S. Adherence to SALT II
(Moscow Domestic Service, 7 Mar 86) 65

Briefs

TASS on U.S. Submarine Missiles Tests 66
TASS on MX Trial Launch 66

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Moscow: Heilbron Explosion Highlights Dangers of U.S. Weapons
(Moscow Domestic Service, 13 Feb 86) 67

TASS Analyst Notes 'Moment of Truth' for West Europe
(Moscow TASS, 4 Mar 86) 68

TASS: Antiwar Leaders Sue Netherlands on Missile Plans
(Moscow TASS, 12 Mar 86) 70

Thatcher Rejects USSR Proposal on UK Arms Freeze
(Tom McMullan; London PRESS ASSOCIATION, 10 Mar 86) 72

Faber's IKV, Labor Party, KKN Differ on Cruise Strategy
(Hubert Smeets; Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 22 Feb 86)...... 73

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

Australian Official Joins Inquiry Into Gulf War Chemical Use
(Melbourne Overseas Service, 28 Feb 86).................... 76

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR Scores U.S. Nuclear Tests for Star Wars
(O. Lukyanov; Moscow TRUD, 20 Feb 86)...................... 77

USSR: U.S. 'Short-Sighted, Egoistic' on Moratorium
(Moscow in English to North America, 22 Feb 86)............ 79

USSR: Six Nations Call for Total Nuclear Test Ban
(Various sources, various dates)........................... 81

Coincides With USSR Stance, by Sergey Pravdin 81
U.S. Rejects Appeal 82
U.S. Public Supports Ban, by V. Gan 83

Soviet Seismologist Assures of Test Monitoring Ability
(Moscow TASS, 11 Mar 86)................................... 84

RELATED ISSUES

USSR Notes 15th Anniversary of Seabed Arms Control Treaty
(Moscow TASS International Service, 10 Feb 86; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 11 Feb 86)............................. 85

'Triumph of Common Sense' 85
U.S. Violation of SALT 86

Socialist Bloc Solidly Defends Peace
(A. Sytezhev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 18 Feb 86)........... 88

Army Paper on USSR's Commitment to Peace Struggle
(Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 23 Feb 86)........................ 91

SED's Axen Writes in PRAVDA on Peace Issues
(Hermann Axen; Moscow PRAVDA, 19 Feb 86)................... 94

Canadian Arms Control Center Attacks NORAD Renewal Report
(Joe O'Donnell; Toronto THE TORONTO STAR, 19 Feb 86)....... 99

Canada: Commons Questions Raised Over Cruise Test Crash
(Charlotte Montgomery, Andrew Nikiforuk; Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL, 26 Feb 86).............................. 101

Canada: New Defense Budget Figures Reported
(Ottawa THE CITIZEN, 28 Feb 86)........................... 103

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR: U.S. SDI CHIEF SAYS REAL WEAPONS SOON TO BE PRODUCED

PM111420 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Mar 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by own correspondent L. Koryavin: "General Clutching at 'Star Sword'."]

[Text] Washington--The United States is expediting production of space weapons. A statement by Lieutenant General O. Abrahamson is proof of this.

He is head of the organization for the implementation of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," or, more accurately, the program to create extensive arsenals of space weapons within the framework of preparations for "star wars." The general was speaking at congressional hearings in order to "substantiate" the need for the United States to implement the strategic plans to militarize space.

J. Abrahamson resorted to disinformation in order to justify the "star wars" program behind a smokescreen. His speech was stereotyped and similar to many speeches by U.S. politicians and military figures. To start with, there was loud talk of the imaginary "Soviet threat" and "Soviet superiority," which has allegedly been achieved in the military plans relating to space.

Gen Abrahamson's "thesis" that the program of preparations for "star wars" is allegedly being implemented "in total accordance with the obligations assumed by the United States under treaties and international agreements" was also false. The general pressed for increased appropriations for space weapons production and bluntly stressed that if funds are obtained in the new 1987 fiscal year the SDI organization "intends to move from developing [razrabotka] technology to holding important practical experiments," which in ordinary language means the mass production of "star wars" weapons, in particular the so-called "space plane" and laser weapons.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1285

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS CONFERENCE ON SDI ISSUE HELD IN U.S.

LD091740 Moscow TASS in English 1701 GMT 9 Mar 86

[Text] San Francisco March 9 TASS -- A conference on the subject "Strategic Defence Initiative -- 'Star Wars' or Security?" has been held here. The conference, which centered on topical issues of arms control, was attended by prominent scientists and experts in the field of Soviet-American relations.

Many of the speakers pointed out the irrelevance of the plans hatched by the Reagan administration to create a large-scale anti-ballistic missile defence system with space-based elements. As Professor Richard Garvin of Cornell University said, the SDI programme does not accord with the security interests of the USA, which should be ensured politically, through an agreement on a radical reduction of the offensive nuclear weapons of the USA and the Soviet Union.

The implementation of the Strategic Defence Initiative, said Blacker, deputy director of the Center on Security and Arms Control at Stanford University, will inevitably lead to a further escalation of the nuclear weapons race. The "star wars" concept does not create any political incentives for a cut in the nuclear arsenals, he pointed out. A renunciation by President Reagan of the SDI and the subsequent radical reduction of strategic offensive weapons is the only way to display political realism.

Speakers at the conference spoke highly of the USSR's foreign policy initiatives put forward in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Congress of the CPSU. The proposals set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev open broad opportunities for progress in the field of arms control, said prominent journalist L. Joiner, who conducted the discussions at the conference. It is necessary that they should be translated into specific agreements between the Soviet Union and the United States, she said.

The conference held in the form of open discussions was also addressed by supporters of SDI. Thus, G. Jonas, deputy head of the organization for the implementation of the "Strategic Defence Initiative" advocated an acceleration of purposeful research within the framework of the "star wars" Programme.

The conference was attended by more than 700 delegates. It was sponsored on the initiative of the local branches of the association for a freeze on nuclear weapons and the organization Physicans for Social Responsibility.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1285

USSR: UK BARS PENTAGON 'CONSULTANTS' FROM SDI FIRMS

PM111121 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 9 Mar 86 Single Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Explanations Demanded"]

[Text] London, 8 Mar -- The British secretary of state for defense has demanded an explanation from the Pentagon regarding the visit by a group of high-ranking "consultants" from across the ocean headed by K. Robinson, the FINANCIAL TIMES, the well-informed organ of British business circles, reports. The officially declared aim of the visit, the newspaper points out, was the intention to "study" those sectors of British industry which will participate in implementation of the American "star wars" program. However, in actual fact the transatlantic visitors intended to carefully check activities of British companies and convey this information to a special Pentagon department which, in the opinion of the FINANCIAL TIMES, is compiling a "top-secret list of important military technology." This is connected with the U.S. military department's plan to classify as top secret the developments of firms which have expressed willingness to cooperate in implementation of the SDI program.

This inevitably means that Britain will have to pay for participation in SDI both by having its national sovereignty undermined and by having its own industrial development retarded. Companies appearing on the Pentagon's secret list, the newspaper points out, would be deprived of the right to apply their technology in the production of non-military products. The blatant nature of this encroachment by the American military on the sovereign rights of another country has forced even the conservative British Government -- a government which usually obediently supports Washington's militarist undertakings -- to stop and think. The secretary of state for defense refused to permit the transatlantic "consultants" to hold talks with British companies. K. Robinson was forced to hastily curtail his visit.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1285

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

TASS: ABRAHAMSON OUTLINES SDI RESEARCH PROGRAMS

LD081910 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 8 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 8 TASS -- The United States is forging ahead with space strike weapons development.

Lt Gen James Abrahamson, head of the organization charged with implementing the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), said at a news conference at the USIA center, that the Pentagon was now working in one of the most promising areas -- the development of free electron lasers. A super high-duty ground-based laser of this type is to be tested at White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico. Judging from the general's words, it is planned to build a large-scale simulation device to carry out the necessary tests under the "star wars" program.

In this connection, Arbahamson expressed regret that the explosion of U.S. space shuttle Challenger disrupted the planned dates of shuttle launches from Vandenberg Air Force Base for accomplishing tasks directly linked with SDI. However, in his words, in the future there are to be only insignificant changes in the schedule of putting military payloads in the orbit under that program.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1285

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

USSR DEPLORES ITALIAN ACCESSION TO SDI

'Unable to Stand Its Ground'

PM111643 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Article by Nikolay Prozhogin: "Washington's Star Bridle"]

[Text] News agencies have reported that the Italian Government has given the "green light" to participation by the country's industrial companies and firms in the American "star wars" program. This decision was taken at a session of a special interministerial committee headed by Bettino Craxi, chairman of the Council of Ministers. Italy has thereby become the third West European state after Britain and the FRG to join the Pentagon's dangerous plans to create space-based strike weapons.

In accordance with the now familiar scenario developed in Washington, U.S. allies are [word indistinct] a secondary role for the fulfillment of which they are promised the reward of an as yet unestablished plus an additional reward in the form of access to the "latest American technology." Some capitalist entrepreneurs have swallowed the bait. Dreaming of immediate, albeit highly problematical profits, and ignoring the threat to mankind concealed in the "star wars" plans and, consequently, the threat to themselves, they are joining the queue for dollar handouts, thereby contributing to the Washington star bridle being thrown over their countries.

It would seem that political figures should be more circumspect. Indeed, it cannot be said that the plan for "star wars" preparations has not aroused keen discussion in Italian political spheres. Voiced in the course of these discussions in particular were well founded fears that implementation of this plan would block a solution to the problem of nuclear arms reduction and elimination. And this problem is particularly painful for Italy, which, having already granted its territory for the deployment of American cruise missiles, has placed itself in the position of a Pentagon nuclear hostage.

However, on the question of joining "star wars," the Italian Government proved unable to stand its ground in the face of pressure from Washington. Meanwhile, the pressure from the other side of the ocean is not letting up. Now, in an attempt to draw its West European allies still deeper into its militarist preparations, Washington is demanding not only actual participation by foreign companies and firms in its "star wars" preparations, but also official support for SDI at a state level, that is, the signing of corresponding intergovernmental agreements. "The United States is pressing its allies and waiting for West European governments to join its project," Italy's ANSA news agency reports, commenting on the talks being held in the Pentagon by an Italian delegation which includes both representatives of a number of state and private companies and high-ranking officials from ministries in Rome.

In this connection it is useful to once again recall the appeal made from the 27th CPSU Congress rostrum to the leaders of states with different social systems to adopt a responsible attitude to the key problem of world politics today -- the problem of war and peace. No sober-minded statesman has the right to evade this responsibility.

U.S. Pressure Continues

LD092202 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1145 GMT 9 Mar 86

[Text] Rome, 9 Mar (TASS) -- Under pressure from Washington, the Italian Government has given the green light to participation by the country's industrial companies and firms in Reagan's "star wars" program. A decision was taken on this at a meeting of a special international committee for the study of this question headed by Italian prime minister Bettino Craxi. In the opinion of the committee, participation in the Strategic Defense Initiative can supposedly "guarantee technological and scientific benefits" to Italian industry.

Italy has thus become the third Western European country, after Great Britain and the FRG, to support the Pentagon's plans for the creation of space-strike weapons. But Washington is not slackening its pressure on Italy, nor on the other West European allies, in order to draw them even more deeply into their militarist preparations. As the newspaper L'UNITA points out today, the United States is exerting pressure with the aim of not only achieving the actual participation of foreign companies and firms in SDI, but also the political support of West European countries, that is, the signing of governmental treaties with the allies. "The United States is rushing its allies and is waiting for West European governments to join its project," the agency ANSA notes, commenting on the course of talks in the Pentagon of an authoritative Italian delegation which has arrived in the United States, comprising high-ranking representatives of ministries and a number of state and private companies.

Italian Delegation's Talks in U.S.

LD122058 Moscow TASS in English 2044 GMT 12 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 12 TASS -- TASS correspondent Vladislav Legantsov reports: An official Italian delegation is currently staying in the USA at the invitation of the U.S. Administration to sound out Italy's possibilities to participate in the "star wars" programme.

The delegation is led by Mario Porta, vice chairman of the interdepartmental committee of the arms manufacturing industry. The delegation also includes representatives of the Ministries of Defence, of Foreign Affairs and of other governmental departments, as well as representatives of Italian private industrial and financial corporations. The members of the delegation have already held a series of meetings at the Pentagon, including with Lieutenant General James Abrahamson, director of the organization for the implementation of the "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI). At present the Italian guests are familiarising themselves with the activity of military and civilian organisations participating in the effort to implement the SDI programme.

The stay of the Italian delegation at the invitation of the U.S. Administration is a new step in the large-scale campaign of the Reagan administration to gear the American allies, above all, the allies in the aggressive NATO bloc, to the "star wars" programme. Italy is the third West European country after Britain and the FRG to have agreed under Washington's pressure to support the plans of the White House to create space strike weapons systems. As James Abrahamson has recently told newsmen, U.S. Administration's delegations visited practically all the NATO member countries in order to draw them in work within the SDI framework.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1285

SOVIET SCIENTIST CONTINUES ASSESSMENT OF SDI WEAKNESSES

LD071147 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 6 Mar 86

["Second part" of a "Soviet technical assessment" of the U.S. SDI program by Dr Boris Rauschenbach, member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and specialist in complex automatic systems, with questions in English by science correspondent Belitskiy; Rauschenbach's answers read in English by unidentified announcer--recorded; from the "Science and Engineering" program]

[Text] [Belitskiy] Dr Rauschenbach, the antiballistic missile systems forming the core of SDI are to be extremely sophisticated automatic systems. Don't you feel that once they're deployed in outer space the situation there will be changed and will not this create new problems, such as humanity never faced before?

[Rauschenbach] I would say in this context that this is an extremely important factor that exerts a strong, if not crucial, influence on the situation in space. Up to now, in discussing all these matters, it's been understood that the parties to a potential conflict would take certain decisions on the strength of their assessment of the situation. These decisions would be taken by human beings. But the deployment of an ABM system in space would not change all these cardinally. There wouldn't be more than a 100 to 300 seconds at the disposal of an anti-missile battlestation from the moment it first detects a target to the moment it uses this or that weapon against it. Its instruments won't have the time to notify either the Pentagon or the President of what's happening. It will have to operate autonomously, independently, in the automatic mode.

[Belitskiy] In other words it will no longer be human beings that take the decisions, not even the military men, let alone political leaders. Decisions will have been entrusted to automatic systems.

[Rauschenbach] Yes, and automatic systems are bound to make mistakes. What this means is that the fate of the world will depend on the performance, on the proper adjustment, of this or that electronic circuit. And such circuits are incredibly complex. They're simply packed with active and passive components; any one of which can malfunction any second.

And no amount of redundant systems, nor any other ingenious strategies of enhancing reliability, can guarantee 100 percent fail-safe operation throughout the equipment's service life. And remember, a battlestation has to remain in orbit for long years, even decades, always on the alert for a launch of enemy missiles. This maans that the probability of a system's malfunction will keep rising. The recent Challenger tragedy, which came as a deep shock to everyone connected with space research, demonstrated that even the most advanced systems are not immune to technical failure.

[Belitskiy] I believe that Challenger was a system of extremely high reliability. Some of its assemblies were not just duplicated but five fold redundancy was built in to them.

[Rauschenbach] Yes, in their space shuttles the Americans even dispensed with the automatic crew rescue systems, such as we have say in the Soyuz space craft, which provide for crew survival in the event of an accident during any state of the launch or flight. Yet this carefully designed and tested system turned out to be far less than 100 percent reliable. At the same time Challenger is a childishly simple system compared with those envisaged in SDI.

[Belitskiy] It's even hard to imagine what would happen should a explosion occur in one of the battlestations in space. The ABM system would surely react to this as the launching of an enemy attack and would activate appropriate weapons systems. That would immediately evoke countermeasures and so on.

[Rauschenbach] Try to visualize a multitude of battlestations belonging to both sides in countless orbits around the earth at the same time. All of them are armed and have supplies of weapons. Their hundreds and thousands of sensors keep sweeping the earth and terrestrial space all on the alert for something suspicious. How can we rule out the possibility, for example, that some rare natural phenomena will not be mistaken by them for a missile launch or that some big fire, explosion or some other event won't trigger their antimissile systems?

[Belitskiy] Things like that have as a matter of fact already happened. There have been cases of American early warning stations mistaking a flock of geese for Soviet nuclear-capable bombers out to attack the United States.

[Rauschenbach] But in those cases, remember, there was invariably enough time to correct the mistake. A missile however is not a bomber. It doesn't leave humans a second for assessing the situation. What's more, in command on both sides is a star wars situation are not thinking people but inhuman computers programmed to wage war. All sorts of computers, computers on board battle stations in space, in missiles, warplanes, submarines, and surface vessels and huge ground-based computer complexes which concentrate and process data. Then, too, there are all sorts of homing devices.

[Belitskiy] What you are saying seems to suggest that this saturation of terrestrial space with all kinds of technology indluding military technology actually creates a new situation, new conditions for the functioning of automatic systems.

[Rauschenbach] I feel that peaceful satellites are only a small factor in turning terrestrial space into one big system. I am using the term system here as meaning a gigantic entity of diverse automatic devices which are in a complex interrelationship, exchange data, take decisions, and issue and execute commands. Big systems are of course a familiar things in modern technology, but here they operate in entirely different conditions.

It simply would never occur to anyone to deliberately deceive telephone exchanges and make them ring the wrong number. The very idea sounds crazy. Similarly, no sane person would ever dream of ways of interfering with the operation of an automatic system controlling say a rolling mill. But that is precisely what's in store for ABM systems. And another point, in industry such big systems are carefully debugged and tuned. This is a long and painstaking process; it dovetails their various assemblies, arranging something like mutual understanding and mutual assistance between them. But how can you possibly tune the big system it's proposed to deploy in space if the plans of preparation for star wars materialize? It's absurd to think that one side will conduct trial launchings of its missiles so that the other side can tune its battlestations to shoot them. Just as it's ridiculous to think that one side will show a potential opponent all the phases of the operation of its battlestations to make sure the stations can be knocked out by the other side's mines.

[Belitskiy] Let me sum up what you've said. What we are talking about is therefore a system that is to operate in the face of deliberate interference. It's also a system that can in principle never be debugged or tuned in its real environment. In short, the SDI system can never be tested.

[Rauschenbach] Yes, this is obvious even to the layman. A test would mean war. This being so the probability of war breaking out not for political reasons but simply because of errors in automatic systems greatly increases. You'd have the science fiction situation of man's survival being threatened by automatic devices of his own creation.

[Belitskiy] By the way, the American sci-fi writer Issac Asimov has said that technology is not to be trusted. If the SDI system is created the ultimate result of a single error on its part can be the extinction of the human race.

[Rauschenbach] This is in fact being realized by more and more scientists and political leaders. They also realize that SDI would upset the entire process of the normalization of Soviet-American relations, a process that seems to have been initiated. Fruitful Soviet-American talks in Geneva on ending the arms race are possible only if that race is not carried into outer space. Besides that, the very idea if nuclear disarmament would suffer, and the Americans continue to pay lip service to it. They keep claiming that SDI is intended to remove the nuclear threat. There is a far more rational way of achieving that, the only rational way to do away with nuclear weapons. That is what the Soviet leadership proposes and if the United States were to respond to this, humanity would enter the 21st century confident of its future.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1285

SOVIET ACADEMICIAN COUNTERS SDI JUSTIFICATIONS

LD101946 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 10 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 10 TASS -- To hold that an impenetrable anti-missile shield will be created as a result of the implementation of the United States SDI programme means to be beguiled with illusions dangerous for entire humanity. Such is the opinion of Academician Vsevolod Avduyevskiy, Soviet scientist prominent in the sphere of scientific and technical problems of space flights.

In an interview to a TASS correspondent, he emphasised a realistic nature of the concept of universal security advanced in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Congress of the Soviet Communists.

It showed convincingly, the scientist said, that present armaments do not hold out hope to any state to protect itself by military-technical means alone. This is the viewpoint from which to regard also the U.S. "Strategic Defence Initiative" which is being publicised as a means of "absolute protection against strategic missiles."

The creators of SDI progamme assert that it will replace the existing strategic balance between the USSR and the USA with a strategy that "does not threaten anyone." It must rely on a space system with the use of directed energy weapons based on new physical principles. But supplementing the U.S. strategic offensive weapons with such a system will lead to a sharp destabilisation of the situation, the academician said. In counter-measure to the creation of the space "shield," means to penetrate it can also be upgraded. Uncertainty about the parity will arise in this connection, mutual distrust will be increased, strategic weapons will be built up and the world will be rapidly moving to the brink of nuclear war.

If the other side also takes the road of the creation of the ABM system with space-basing elements, it will be very difficult to evaluate the correlation of forces because of structural and technical peculiarities of the two ABM systems, even if their distinctions are insignificant. Tension and the arms race will inevitably be stepped up in this case. In other words, SDI will not render nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete." Its true aim is to create possibilities for dealing with impunity a first nuclear strike at the USSR and then to repulse a retaliatory, already weakened strike of Soviet missiles.

The alternative to such a use of space is its peaceful exploration stimulation many spheres of science and technology, true development of peoples, Vsevolod Avduyevskiy said. The only way to survive in the nuclear age is the policy of arms reduction, of keeping from the militarisation of space. Such precisely is the essence of the Soviet peace initiatives endorsed by the forum of the Soviet Communists that ended on March 6.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1285

ITALIAN GOVERNMENT AGREES TO INDUSTRY'S SDI PARTICIPATION

LD081754 Rome International Service in Italian 1555 GMT 8 Mar 86

[Text] Yesterday the government gave its go-ahead to the participation of Italian industry in the U.S. SDI project. During the meeting of the appropriate ministerial committee chaired by Craxi, president of the Council of Ministers, a favorable assessment was made of the technical investigation conducted by a special working group; in addition, a new, in-depth examination of the problem was asked for to allow new verification to be made before the final presentation of the Italian position.

This means that Italian industry is free to sign cooperation contracts with the United States for the advancement of the SDI program but that the Italian Government, while recognizing the potential validity of the project which is intended to (?minimize) the nuclear threat with a defense shield, does not support, at least for the time being, President Reagan's proposal which has an important impact in the field of East-West relations.

Besides, stated an Italian official note, the government still has to report to the Parliament about the whole issue.

According to observers, the potitical disengagement by the Rome government from the space shield does not mean that Italy is not interested in SDI projects. In its reply to the U.S. cooperation offer the government will in fact ask to be constantly informed on both the technological development of the program and the political and military assessment of the Soviet-U.S. disarmament negotiations. On the complex question of the SDI, Italy has thus limited its support to its scientific and technological aspect, as the FRG has already done, unlike Great Britain, which has joined the program on the political plane as well. [Paris AFP in English at 1554 GMT on 7 March reports on Italy's announcement that it is "favorable" to participation by local defense contractors in the U.S. SDI, and adds: "A high-level Italian delegation, made up of military officials and representatives from about 20 firms, has left here for Washington for talks with counterparts in the United States to determine the role Italian researchers might play, informed sources said."]

/9274
CSO: 5200/2648

BELGIAN REPORT ON POSSIBLE EUROPEAN SPACE DEFENSE

Brussels KNACK in Dutch 22 Jan 86 pp 35-37

[Article by KL-D: "Then We Will Just Make Our Own Star Wars"; capitalized passages emphasized in original]

[Text] According to a report from SEVI [Emile Vandervelde Institute Study and Documentation Center], the Flemish Socialist Party's think tank, some American and West German circles are thinking about a Western European counterpart to Ronald Reagan's SDI plan.

The Emile Vandervelde Institute in Brussels is never at a loss for a report. With the regularity of clockwork it compiles usually outstanding reports. At the end of 1985 defense specialist Bernard Tuyttens wrote up a SEVI report on the upcoming discussion about a separate European Star Wars program. And that turns out to be an excellent survey of what is publicly known about the state of affairs in this matter.

Despite a number of official American statements that the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) is also intended to defend Western Europe, there are quite a few specialists, Tuyttens says, who believe that the Soviet Union's nuclear threat to the old continent is of a considerably different nature than that facing the United States. Instead of intercontinental missiles (ICBM's), Europe must deal with short-range weapons (SS-21 and 22) and intermediate-range ones (SS-20), as well as with long-range missiles with a variable range (SS-11 and 19), submarine-launched missiles, and bombers like the Backfire and the Badger.

To deal with this strategic difficulty, the SEVI defense specialist explains, people have recently called for a kind of mini-defense of Western Europe. On the American side this has taken the shape first and foremost of a proposal to transfer to European territory the so-called Terminal Phase of the SDI program. In fact what this option comes down to is Europe's purchasing technology of the kind the U.S. Army has tested successfully over the past 2 years. The interception of enemy missiles just before they strike is more or less the centerpiece of American SDI research.

The most eye-catching element in this is the Sure Hit Missile, designed by the American firm Aerospace and Defence Co. But probably of equal importance is the role of advanced computers and of the Airborne Optical Adjunct (AOA), a detection and communications system to be set up in space. Like the Sure Hit, the AOA is part of the American SDI research.

"The slickest argument they will use to sell this system to the Western European public," Bernard Tuyttens says, "is to present it as being intended to serve as an element in the negotiations with the Soviet Union. In a word, something to be negotiated away at the first opportunity." Will the European politicians be prepared to believe that again this time? The Socialists, for their part, are already on their guard. At the end of the 1970's there were countless attempts to present the Euromissiles in that way, but in retrospect the two-track decision of 1979 looks more like a decision to arm, with a FOOTNOTE ABOUT NEGOTIATIONS.

High Frontier

In West Germany a number of Christian Democrats headed by Defense Minister Wörner launched a second initiative at the end of last year. With support from Bavarian Prime Minister Franz Josef Strauss (CSU [Christian Social Union]) and from CDU [Christian Democratic Union] Parliamentary Floor Leader Dregger, the West German Defense Ministry wants to develop its own plan to counter short-range weapons threatening Western Europe, and West Germany in particular. That idea is said to have come up for discussion for the first time during the most recent NATO autumn meeting in Evere (December 1985).

According to Bernard Tuyttens this is an ambitious program aiming at dealing with both ballistic and non-ballistic missiles. The American SDI--officially at least--is intended only to put ballistic missiles out of action. According to the weekly magazine DER SPIEGEL, the German firm MBB (Messerschmitt-Bölkow-Blohm) has been working since 1983 under contract from the West German Defense Ministry, at high speed and in the strictest secrecy, to supply studies and drafts for this project. Siemens and Telefunken are said to have provided necessary support.

There are two possibilities. First and foremost there is the high energy laser, which is said to be being constructed in cooperation with the Nuremburg firm Diehl. Bonn is reputed to have spent DM 25 million on this project so far. Another possibility is the electromagnetic cannon, or rail gun, which shoots 60 times a second to fire metal objects or target-seeking projectiles at enemy missiles at high speed.

The difference between the two European (German!) options and the American Sure Hit Missile is that the first two can carry out a full-fledged ABM mission. That is to say, they can destroy enemy missiles immediately upon launch. In the United States the Terminal Defence will protect only military installations. On the other hand, the Americans will probably be ready sooner with their project. To develop the high energy laser and the electromagnetic cannon will require at least another 10 years.

Still, it does not matter very much to the United States which is decided on in the end, Tuyttens says. As long as something is done to eliminate the zones of unequal security which SDI would create. The German initiatives, for instance, received strikingly strong support at a recent symposium held in the Netherlands by a group called High Frontier Europa. High Frontier Europa is the European section of the American High Frontier organization, which receives support from the extreme-Conservative Heritage Foundation in Washington, among others.

Patriot

Finally Bernard Tuyttens feels there is yet a fourth weapons system that could play a Star Wars role for Western Europe, and that is the modified Patriot Missile. The Patriot is supposed to gradually replace the obsolete Nike-Hercules Missile in Europe. The job of the modified Patriot would be to intercept enemy missiles by means of warheads carrying large quantities of steel fragments. According to Pentagon estimates a system of this type could be fully operational by 1992, while the British weekly THE ECONOMIST estimates total costs at more than 30 BILLION dollars.

Thus far there have not been any negotiations about Western European financial participation in a project to convert the Patriot into an anti-missile missile, although the Pentagon has been considering such a project for some time. The Nato Air Defense Committee (NACD) even believes it must be possible at a later stage to achieve operational cooperation among all the European air defense systems, including anti-tactical ones, by using various early warning systems such as infrared detectors installed in aircraft.

The SEVI report on a possible European Defense Initiative to supplement SDI costs 160 francs. It can be ordered from SEVI, Grasmarkt 105, bus 47, 1000 Brussels.

12593
CSO: 5200/2630

POLISH PRESS REPORTS FRG CDU STAND ON SDI PROGRAM

Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 28 Nov 85 p 7

[Article by Ryszard Drecki]

[Text] A special committee of the ruling Christian Democratic Union [CDU] concerned with military policy announced Wednesday its acceptance of a resolution which "recommends West German participation in research on the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] program".

The Christian Democratic body proclaimed that "the FRG is intensely interested in current research (on the "Star Wars" program) and its results." The ten-point resolution reiterated American pseudo-arguments supposedly justifying space-based weapons and stipulates FRG participation for various reasons such as the "need for Europeans to secure influence over SDI research goals and content and to possibly achieve the ability to control its results".

In reality, Bonn's heightened enthusiasm for participation in the "Star Wars" program as seen by Rhineland observers is out of "European" considerations but rather due to the political ambitions of the West German right wing. To no lesser degree is the hope of increasing lucrative new orders for local concerns specializing in the production of high-tech weaponry. The importance to the Bonn government of this last motive was evidenced Tuesday in a speech made by CDU Deputy B. Friedman during parliamentary budget debates calling for an increase in weapons contracts for large West German firms.

The Christian Democrat committee resolution is only advisory in character. However, we should not ignore the fact that this is the first time that a central ruling party has expressed itself so unequivocally for FRG participation in an American space-based weapon program. This resolution, therefore, is being treated here as the first step in "preparing" the public for an eventual government decision. Chancellor Kohl stated in an interview published Wednesday in the KOELNER STADT ANZEIGER that this decision will be made "before the Christmas holiday". This would then make "Star Wars" a Christmas present, so to speak.

13090/12828
CSO: 5200/3022

SDI-ASAT CONTROVERSIES, VULNERABILITIES EXAMINED IN PRESS

Warsaw POLITYKA in Polish 12 Oct 85 p 13

[Article by Tadeusz Pioro]

[Text] The first test on the "Star Wars" program was conducted in early September when the Americans carried out a successful trial of the ASAT missile system. In the following article, Tadeusz Pioro examines the problem as an expert on the subject. The problem is not merely a technical question but a political one in which regulation will not only affect future relations between the two super-powers but also the prospects for world peace. Let us not forget that the USSR is prepared for a sharp reduction in the strategic arms arsenal in exchange for U.S. renunciation of the "Star Wars" program.

Most of what we know on the subject of "Star Wars" we owe to American research on future space-based weapons which has been made public.

The aim in acquiring technical superiority usually follows the principle that one side reveals as little information as possible. However, little time has elapsed since Ronald Reagan's appeal to scientists to concentrate their efforts in "providing Americans with the capability to make atomic weapons useless and obsolete" and the flood of information available from a number of sources assuring thousands of pages of material on the description of both the projected goals of the space-based system and on what has already been successfully built.

The purpose of this display is an obvious demonstration of American technological superiority over that of the Soviets. However, it does not take into consideration the possibility that the Soviet Union may already possess a similarly advanced technological capability which will only take a short period of time before it is "initiated". Time and, let us add, the right conditions because the Russians have as yet not come forward with a demonstration before the Americans of their own version of a future weapons system.

We must, however, distinguish between that which exists and that which does not and probably will not exist for quite some time. We must separate reality from fantasy. The tests planned by the Americans for this year (there will be three attempts made to destroy satellites with missiles fired from high-flying airplanes) are undoubtedly a forecast of the future but are also far removed from the type of high-powered lasers, emitting either elementary molecules or electromagnetic impulses, needed to initiate the system referred to as the "Strategic Defense Initiative" or SDI.

Reality

The concept of destroying satellites from the earth is not as new as has been written. It goes back to the early stages of aeronautics. In reality, generals never excelled in comprehending scientific discoveries and always preferred that which could be marked on a map. However, when the first satellites began to appear, the military, feeling it their duty, began to contemplate ways of destroying them.

The first American test was conducted in 1959, barely two years after the launching of the first sputnik. It involved firing a missile from a B-47 Bomber at the "Explorer 6" satellite revolving in a low orbit. The experiment was carried out successfully. Another system tested concerned bringing together an "armed" satellite with one which was to be destroyed by a mock firing of missiles at close range. These "encounters" were carried out successfully and in accordance with the intended objectives. Dozens of such tests were conducted by the U.S. in the early 1960's.

In the past decade, American engineers were engaged in the Antisatellite Interception System [ASAT], that is, firing a high-speed missile from a hunter-bomber F-15 at a "specified" satellite. In its first stage, this missile weighed over a ton but was later reduced to 16 kilograms with a diameter of 30 centimeters. This then made it possible to shoot the missile from any airplane as long as it was connected to a ground-based steering mechanism which could guide it through the use of radar. The first test of the ASAT system took place in January, 1984, when it successfully shot a two meter ballon that had been led into space by a "Scout" rocket.

This system has currently been perfected and will be subject to further testing beginning this year. The first test was scheduled for September of this year.

This led to the possibility of using the magnetic force which exists beyond the earth's atmosphere to hurl a metal "projectile" at high speed. An American laboratory has already succeeded in causing a ten gram plastic bullet to travel at a speed of two kilometers per second. This speed, however, is still not enough since the warhead of an intercontinental missile travels at a speed three times as fast. The intended goal is to increase the speed five-fold with a missile weighing one to two kilograms in order to be able to fit it with guiding equipment. It has been calculated that a 100 ton satellite is capable of storing enough energy to return approximately one hundred of these "projectiles".

Here, however, we are beginning to go beyond today's reality. Today, a missile traveling beyond the earth's atmosphere can be defended by employing other means as was evidenced by an experiment conducted in June, 1984. A rocket shot from California's Vandenberg Air Base carrying an unarmed warhead and traveling 180 kilometers from the earth's surface was to plunge at a predesignated point in the area of the Kwajalein Atoll (Marshall Islands) in the Pacific Ocean. The warhead was detected by radar and several minutes later an antimissile equipped with an infra-red sensing device was launched from a nearby island and from a distance of several hundred kilometers locked in on the "attacking" warhead. As it got closer to its target, the rocket, beginning to take the shape of a battered umbrella, struck the warhead at a speed of 25,000 kilometers per hour. Both rockets exploded.

"The Americans-written triumphantly after the experiment-succeeded in destroying a ballistic missile which was still in space by using an interceptor rocket launched from earth. We achieved a great success in the arms race between the East and West in addition to attaining an antimissile program".

However, some doubts have emerged. An imagined adversary could after all begin launching a thousand ballistic missiles simultaneously both from the land and sea. Each rocket could stop ten warheads traveling on individual courses. Tens of thousands of missiles were to be dealt with through this type of defense system. The situation could be complicated further through transporting, with rockets, thousands of "decoys" into space, such as, pieces of metal which would interfere with radar or fake missiles like balloons covered with aluminum foil to make them indistinguishable from real missiles either by radar or infra-red tracking devices.

This, after all, is only a hypothetical case. It is doubtful that either side would decide to launch half its arsenal all at one time. In summation, an intercontinental ballistic missile is not like a cannon which one can reload after a short period of time. Still it is exactly this apocalyptic picture that the SDI program is meant to oppose.

Prospects

The weapon, which we have described, has a range limited to several hundred kilometers in orbit. This will allow intercepting both reconnaissance and observatory satellites, but not all of them. Satellites rotating in higher orbits are for now not threatened. The Pentagon conducted a successful test 2 years ago with a "laser gun" mounted on an airplane. It shot down another plane, flying without a crew, of course. This, however, occurred at a low altitude, far from the flight path of an intercontinental missile which can travel upwards of 1200 kilometers above the earth's surface.

The problem with all this lies mainly with the fact that this system which is projected for the end of this century is in reality still at the research stage and prone to various interpretations.

Some fundamental decisions have still not been made as evidence by numerous proposals and opinions published on this subject. For instance, on what should research and planning focus? Are we to propose placing in geostatic orbits (36,000 kilometers above the earth) gigantic satellites equipped with chemical or optical lasers, and with mirrors at least 30 meters in diameter powering them and putting them on course? Are we to favor the development of lasers working at radiation X and drawing energy from the explosion of small atomic bombs (this project is being conducted by the largest weapons research center, the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California)? Are we to promote a weapon system contingent on an electron mass, even though this concept is barely in its infancy? Or are we to concentrate on a system that could be developed at the earliest possible date, which would be placing hundreds of satellites in a low orbit, each fitted with dozens of small rockets with a potential speed twice that of ballistic missiles and launched at the moment when the missile enters the atmosphere, still in its first phase?

Each of these plans has its own learned enthusiasts (some of whom surely appeal for world peace) and military defenders. Currently, the ASAT system is the only system for which the basic design is in place.

Developers of these future systems are in general agreement over one thing, that the war against ballistic missiles should commence within several seconds of their launching. This will render the majority of them harmless while still in their first phase which lasts approximately 5 minutes. Afterwards, the missiles begin to travel inertly (without jet propulsion). In this phase it is difficult to detect the scattered missiles and to register their flight parameters as well as to distinguish between decoys and actual missiles which may prove to be the most vital task of all. It would still be possible to shoot down missiles in their third phase, that is, when entering the earth's atmosphere. However, in the case of this kind of attack, the local population would suffer considerable loss of life.

There are various defense concepts proposed for each missile flight phase. However, there is no answer to the most basic question: how is all this suppose to work? "This is not a contest to see who can urinate the farthest" said one American physicist sceptical of the SDI program. The problem is whether the system, as a whole, will be capable of meeting its ascribed role. We must design a system beginning with basic elements and create scores of subsystems--surveillance, communications, warning, information, command, control, etc.

The program "proposed" by the American president in March, 1983 has entered its research and experimental stage just in this past year. Preliminary research is directed at three broad areas: new materials (mainly metal and ceramic, linking two features vital for objects placed in space - lightweight and durability), an information network (to increase performance), and energy storage in outer space.

13090/12828
CSO: 5200/3022

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

POLES QUOTE ABRAHAMSON ON SDI RESEARCH PROGRESS

Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY in Polish 28 Nov 85 p 6

[Text] The head of the "Star Wars" program, Air Force General James Abrahamson, Tuesday announced to reporters in Washington that research on the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) shows more significant progress than originally anticipated.

The SDI program will be completed in accordance with the proposed objectives, despite the recent budget cuts in the program. This will allow the President to decide in the early 1990's whether the program is technically feasible, that is, whether it is possible to make the system operational.

General Abrahamson stated that progress has been made in a number of areas, one of them being the development of land lasers. Lasers were to have been operated through the use of mirrors placed in space and directed at airborne rockets for the purpose of destroying them.

Meanwhile, Paul Warnke, a well-known American specialist on arms control and past head of the U.S. delegation involved in arms talks with the USSR, expressed criticism of the SDI program at San Francisco's Union Club.

He stated that the realization of the "Star Wars" program will make a reduction in the nuclear arsenal of both the U.S. and USSR impossible and, in addition, seriously intensify the international situation.

Currently, continued the American expert, the issue can be described as follows: either "Star Wars" or arms control.

Paul Warnke asserted that the recent Geneva summit between Gorbachev and Reagan resulted in opening favourable prospects for increasing world security based on a proposal to reduce the strategic nuclear stockpile by 50 percent.

13090/12828
CSO: 5200/3022

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

CANADIAN FEAR OF POSSIBLE TERRITORY USE FOR SDI DISCUSSED

Arms Control, Scientists Groups

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 24 Feb 86 pp A1, A2

[Article by Jeff Sallot]

[Text]

The massive Star Wars research effort in the United States is examining weapons systems and ballistic missile defences that could require Canadian territory for their deployment.

Research for Star Wars, known formally as the strategic defence initiative, is still in its infancy and the systems might never be deployed.

Moreover, U.S. officials from President Ronald Reagan on down promise that no deployment of Star Wars systems will be made without consultation with Canada and other Western allies.

Nevertheless, arms control experts in Canada, some prominent U.S. scientists, and peace groups in both countries caution that the the Pentagon could be proceeding with its $26-billion (U.S.) SDI on the presumption that Canadian geography and co-operation would be available if the time ever came to deploy the systems.

Ottawa has never made that promise. On the contrary, two of the three parties represented in the House of Commons vehemently oppose Star Wars as a dangerous destabilizing of the nuclear balance, and the governing Conservative Party is divided on the issue.

The Mulroney Government has cautiously endorsed SDI as prudent research. But under intense domestic political pressure from peace groups and from within his own caucus, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney last September backed away from participation in the research program on a government-to-government basis. Private Canadian companies are free to bid on research projects.

Analysts at the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament, an independent think tank, say that the most promising prospects for ballistic missile defences would require intercepting and destroying Soviet rockets and warheads in midcourse or as they begin falling on targets on North America in the so-called terminal phase of flight.

A critical factor in ballistic missile defence is getting enough time to hit Soviet rockets. The time is needed for sensing devices to sort out real warheads from decoys.

Placing components of a system as close as possible to the Soviet Union would provide an extra margin of time.

It therefore makes a lot of sense from a technical standpoint to put components such as sensors and midcourse interceptors in the far north of Canada, said Ronald Purver, the centre's director of research.

There are at least three components that might be deployed in Canada, said John Pike, associate director for space policy for the Federation of American Scientists.

These are the airborne optical system (AOS), the terminal imaging radar (TIR), and the high-altitude endo-atmospheric defence interceptor (HEDI), Dr. Pike told a conference in Ottawa earlier this winter.

The optical system's sensors would provide initial target tracking and other data to help distinguish real warheads from decoys.

That system, in turn, would pass data along to the terminal imaging radars, which would continue target tracking.

The interceptors, or HEDIs, are ground-based rockets. The two-staged rockets would intercept targets at altitudes of 15 to 50 kilometres from the ground.

The SDI research program calls for the testing of HEDIs in flight before the end of this decade.

Canada might be required for the basing of other components, Dr. Pike said. These could include ground-based lasers to shoot down ballistic missiles and the Excalibur X-ray laser, which would be launched on warning of an attack. The Excalibur weapon, named after the sword of King Arthur, could be based either on submarines or on ground, officials of the SDI office in Washington say. It therefore need not be based in Canada.

However, Dr. Pike said submarine basing has several drawbacks, such as the difficulty of communications and vulnerability to pre-emptive attack. Basing Excalibur in areas such as Alaska, Canada, and Northern Europe may prove to be an attractive alternative to submarine basing, Dr. Pike said.

U.S. Air Force General Robert Herres, the commander of the U.S. Space Command, said recently that he did not know if Canadian geography would be involved in deployment of a SDI ballistic missile defence system.

That is because the SDI technology is still in an early research stage, he said. Gen. Herres added that it is sensible, however, for Canada to participate in a ballistic missile defence system for the entire continent.

Gen. Herres is also the commander-in-chief of the North American Aerospace Defence Command, or NORAD, which is a joint command with Canada. Its job is to provide early warning of a ballistic missile attack and to defend against attack by Soviet bombers.

External Affairs Minister's Response

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 25 Feb 86 p A8]

[Text] Fears that the U.S. Star Wars research program will require Canadian territory for the deployment of weapons systems and ballistic-missile defences are unfounded, External Affairs Minister Joe Clark said yesterday. "The fears raised by the story in The Globe and Mail this morning are unfounded," Mr. Clark told the Commons in response to a request from Liberal MP Len Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins had asked if the minister would "assure Canadians that our country has not and will not be considered for use in any future development of the strategic defence initiative (the formal name for Star Wars)." The Globe and Mail reported yesterday that arms-control experts in Canada, some prominent U.S. scientists and peace groups in both countries fear that the Pentagon could be proceeding with its $26-billion (U.S.) Star Wars research program on the presumption that Canadian geography and co-operation would be available if the time ever came to deploy the systems.

/9317
CSO: 5220/30

TAKEIRI HOLDS SDI TALKS WITH WEINBERGER

OW120119 Tokyo KYODO in English 0047 GMT 12 Mar 86

[Text] Washington, March 11 KYODO -- Japanese participation in the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) project will not be bound to an agreement of confidentiality U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger said here Tuesday. Weinberger told visiting Komeito Chairman Yoshikatsu Takeiri that, except for a few special cases, Japanese agreement to guarantee secrecy over SDI-related research would not be necessary.

An aide to Takeiri said the chairman of Japan's second largest opposition party also mentioned local oppostiion to a proposal that night landing practice facilities for U.S. jets be moved from Atsugi Air Base to Miyake Island. Although the Komei party has voiced strong oppostition to the plan, the aide said Takeiri only told Weinberger that the islanders are divided over construction plans.

In an earlier meeting Tuesday with Richard Armitage, assistant defense secretary for international security affairs, Takeiri said his country is interested in obtaining software for information analysis accompanying the U.S.-developed over-the-horizon (OTH) backscatter radar when the system is introduced to Japan.

Takeiri, heading an 11-man delegation on a 13-day visit to the United States, has proposed meetings with government and congressional leaders to discuss security and bilateral issues, as well as East-West relations. During their 15-minute meeting, Weinberger urged Japan to join the SDI project as early as possible adding that he will discuss the matter with Japanese officials when he visits Tokyo in April.

Although the U.S. has demanded agreements of confidentiality with participating nations over SDI research, the defense secretary said that it would be preferable but not necessary for Japan, considering the high level of trust between the two nations.

Takeiri, bringing up the problem of U.S. night landing practice facilities on Miyakejima, maintained that his party was primarily interested in respecting the "intentions of the local residents." However, the residents were united neither in oppostiion nor support of the construction plan, he said, adding "time is necessary to determine which course the residents will take."

Takeiri's spokesman said that during their meeting Armitage indicated that if Japan was interested in obtaining software to analyze OTH radar-related information, the United States was ready to offer it. U.S. officials have reportedly turned down Japanese defense agency requests to date for software to go along with the OTH system.

As part of its five-year plan [beginning April] to beef up national defense, the defense agency is studying the OTH system for domestic use. According to Armitage, the United States is planning to have two OTH facilities in the western Pacific by 1988.

/9738
CSO: 5260/052

JAPAN TO SEND THIRD FACT-FINDING SDI MISSION TO U.S.

OW040559 Tokyo KYODO in English 0531 GMT 4 Mar 86

[Text] Tokyo, 4 March KYODO -- The government will send a third fact-finding mission to the United States this month in connection with Japan's possible participation in research for the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), government officials said Tuesday. The dispatch of the mission, which will include representatives of private industry, is construed as indicating the likelihood of Japan participating in research for the space-based antimissile program, known as "star wars."

The government is expected to inform the U.S. of Japan's participation when U.S. Defense Secretary Casper Weinberger visits Japan in early April or when Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone visits the U.S. in mid-April. Nakasone is determined to have Japan participate in the SDI research from the viewpoint of developing high technology, unity in the Western bloc and strategic stability. Nakasone also wants to make a decision on Japan's participation in the SDI research before the Tokyo summit of seven major industrial democracies in early May. Britain and West Germany have already agreed to take part in SDI research. However, Nakasone may possibly have to iron out a difference of views with Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe, who is cautious about the matter, before the government makes its final decision.

After sending two fact-finding missions to the U.S. last year, the government is considering allowing private industry's participation so as to provide a boost for general-purpose high technology.

The dispatch of the first government-private sector joint mission signifies the government's approval of private industry's participation in the SDI research. The mission will discuss with U.S. officials Japan's possible participation in the SDI research at both the private industry and government levels.

/12929
CSO: 5260/049

JAPAN MINISTRY OFFICIAL URGES CAUTION IN SDI DECISION

OW051259 Tokyo KYODO in English 1254 GMT 5 Mar 86

[Text] Tokyo, 5 March KYODO -- Japan should not make a hasty decision on whether or not to join in the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), a senior Foreign Ministry official said Wednesday, adding that it would be reasonable if a decision was made two or three months after the Tokyo economic summit in May. The official, who declined to be identified, said there are certain procedures to follow in leading up to a government decision on the SDI issue. The decision cannot be made by Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone alone, he said, adding that Foreign Minister Shintaro Abe favors a prudent approach to the issue.

The official Japanese position on the SDI project is that Japan "understands" the necessity for the United States to develop such a space-based anti-missile system. But so far Japan has refused to make a commitment to cooperate with the United States on the research program, despite repeated U.S. prodding.

The Foreign Ministry official confirmed that a Japanese mission comprising government officials and representatives of the private sector will be leaving for the United States later this month to study the SDI project, but he cautioned that the visit does not presuppose Japan's participation in the research program. He said that cabinet ministers concerned are expected to deliberate the matter after the Japanese mission returns from the United States. He also said the government is unlikely to make up its mind on the issue before Nakasone's upcoming trip to the United States, scheduled around April 13.

/12929
CSO: 5260/050

BRIEFS

WEINBERGER ASKS JAPAN TO JOIN PROGRAM--U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger has called on Japan to join in the star wars program as soon as possible. The Pentagon chief stated the United States' interest in receiving highly complex Japanese technology for the implementation of its space militarization program. According to Weinberger, discussion of the details of a forthcoming agreement on Tokyo's participation in the star wars program will be one of the main topics of talks during his visit to Japan. [Text] [Moscow Television Service in Russian 1956 GMT 11 Mar 86] /8309

TASS ON U.S. ABM TEST FACILITY--Washington, 10 Mar (TASS)--The defense NEWS BULLETIN reports that the U.S. Defense Department is going to spend about 10.3 million dollars in fiscal 1987 on the construction of a number of facilities to test advanced weapons which are to be used in the large-scale partially space-based ABM system. According to the bulletin, 4.2 million dollars will be expended on the construction of a testing site at the Edwards Air Force Base in California, where kinetic weapons are going to be tested. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2042 GMT 10 Mar 86] /8309

SPD URGES FRG TO 'RENOUNCE' SDI--Bonn, 11 Mar (TASS)--The Presidium of the Board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) issued a statement here today urging the West German Government to renounce the participation in the U.S. "star wars" programme and also in the implementation of the so-called "European Defence Initiative," a West European equivalent of the U.S. project. The leading body of the West German key opposition party demanded that the West German Government come out immediately for terminating all nuclear weapon tests, freezing nuclear arsenals and oppose the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 2001 GMT 11 Mar 86] /8309

ENVOY OPPOSES SDI FACILITY USE--Australia's ambassador for disarmament, Mr Richard Butler, says the federal government should oppose the use of the American-Australian joint defense facilities at Pine Gap and Murrungar bases in the testing program for President Reagan's so-called Star Wars defense system. Mr Butler told a public meeting at Melbourne's Monash University that Australia has told the Reagan administration it did not endorse the Strategic Defense Initiative. He said he did not know if the American bases would be used in the testing of star wars but it would be consistent with Australia's position if any such moves were opposed. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0130 GMT 13 Mar 86 BK] /6662

CSO: 5200/4316

USSR: FRG SINGS 'FROM U.S. SCORE' IN REPLY TO SOVIET PROPOSAL

LD230330 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Viktor Mikhaylovich Glazunov report from Bonn; from the "International Diary" program presented by Igor Surguchev]

[Text] We hope that the healthy, constructive spirit of Geneva will find reflection in the U.S. reply. [to the Soviet proposals] We are continuing the theme of the West's reaction to Comrade Gorbachev's statement. Joining our conversation now is the correspondent in Bonn, Viktor Glazunov. Viktor Mikhaylovich, what is the position of the FRG Government?

[Glazunov] In Bonn, with a conservative-liberal government they have become accustomed to sing from the U.S.' score. As only the first bars existed for a long time in the U.S. score, they repeated them in Bonn, too. All this sounded something like this: Yes, the Soviet initiative contains positive elements. We welcome them; we will reply to them in a constructive manner. The matter of replying got delayed with the United States, and everyone in Bonn was unable to come up with anything of their own.

[Surguchev] What can be said about the recent consultations by Nitze, the U.S. President's special adviser on disarmament issues, with the FRG leaders?

[Glazunov] Well, what was noted first and foremost in connection with the consultations by Paul Nitze? Washington is keeping to its program of space weapons. This means that the main obstacle in eliminating nuclear weapons on the planet remains. At the center of the consultations was the question of medium range nuclear weapons in Europe. A question of extreme importance, as everyone understands, because the siting of U.S. Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe and primarily in the FRG had led to a considerable deterioration in the situation on the continent. By all accounts, Washington wants to counter the Soviet proposal for the total elimination of the medium-range missiles of the USSR and of the United States in the European zone with Reagan's modernized zero option. This is how it is all presented in the press at any rate. Chancellor Kohl came to power with the slogan: Peace with Fewer Weapons. Over the period of his rule, 108 Pershing II's have appeared in the FRG. In March, the siting of cruise missiles will begin. An agreement with Washington on the FRG's participation in the SDI, the space weapons program, is expected. In practice, there are not fewer weapons but more.

[Surguchev] Viktor Mikhaylovich, it is interesting, what is their attitude on the Rhine to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions?

[Glazunov] They decline the moratorium in Bonn, in unison with Washington. There is iron logic here: Whoever is for the SDI, must also be for nuclear tests, because the implementation of SDI is impossible without tests. I would like to quote here the words of (?Herman Scherr), a military and political expert of the Social-Democratic faction in the Bundestag. The suspicion is gaining ground, he said the other day, that the conservative-liberal government speaks publicly about disarmament, but in fact does not attach any significance to this.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1288

USSR: U.S. CONTINUES OPPOSING ARMS CONTROL MEASURES

PM121015 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Mar 86 Single Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "At a Historic Turning Point"]

[Text] We live in a troubled and contradictory world. It is characterized on the one hand by the increasing interdependence of countries and peoples, and on the other by confrontation among different social forces and by conflicts of very great intensity. A sober and profound assessment of the situation that has arisen in the international arena leads to the unambiguous conclusion that mankind is at a turning point in its history.

This conclusion was drawn at the 27th CPSU Congress -- in the party Central Committee's Political Report to the congress and in the documents adopted by the Soviet Communists' top party forum. This conclusion is based on a creative Marxist-Leninist analysis and on a reiterpretation of all factors of modern world development. The congress gave exhaustive replies to the most burning questions of our time. The congress emphasized very strongly that the complexity and acuteness of the historical moment render still more urgent the task of outlawing nuclear weapons, totally eliminating them and other weapons of mass destruction, and improving international relations. At the same time, reducing the time taken to seek political accords and going over as quickly as possible to constructive actions is a pressing condition for success in solving urgent questions of international life.

Moscow points the way to improve international relations and to eliminate the terrible danger hanging over mankind. The world public and the governments of many countries have perceived the concept of mutual and universal security and a nuclear-free world, advanced by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary in his 15 January statement, as an event of truly epoch-making significance. All the world's peoples equally desire and cherish the goals set in the statement. The world held its breath as it read and heard the Soviet Union's historically significant proposals for the total elimination of nuclear weapons before the end of this century and the prevention of militarization of space, and their further development and concretization at the 27th CPSU Congress.

But what of the U.S. Administration? How has official Washington reacted to the large-scale Soviet peace initiatives?

Before answering these questions of vital significance to all mankind, it would not be out of place to cite the words of U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz: "Our countries proceed from irreconcilably different views of the world." There is no getting away from the fact that this is so. The world of capital and, above all, the right wing of the U. S. monopoly bourgeoisie have not abandoned the ideology and policy of hegemonism. They continue to entertain illusory hopes of social revenge and of strong-arm superiority. The U.S. ruling circles still regard fueling international tension as a way of justifying increased military appropriations, global pretensions, and interference in other countries' affairs. In short, because of its social nature, imperialism constantly generates an aggressive, adventurist policy.

Proceeding from their aggressive policy, in recent years imperialist states have stepped up militarist preparations still further. The tone is set in this matter by the United States, which has become the citadel of international reaction and militarism. It is intensively deploying ground-, air-, and sea-based strategic offensive forces and developing weapons based on new physical principles. The number of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe is increasing. The United States is reorganizing its Armed Forces with a view to considerably increasing their combat potential. Parts of the world thousands of miles distant from the United States are declared zones of its "national interests." Washington's plans to implement the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," which provides for the deployment of strike weapons in space, represent a special danger. On the other side of the ocean supremacy in space is regarded as a means that can ensure supremacy on earth. Thus, the U.S. "star wars" program is a program for the peoples' renewed enslavement and subjection to imperialist diktat.

The chief purpose of Washington's actions in implementing SDI and further escalating the nuclear arms race is to achieve decisive military superiority over the USSR and to be able to threaten it with a nuclear first strike. All this is leading to the creation of a real threat of war being unleashed against the Soviet Union and other socialist states.

The U.S. President's reply to the 15 January Soviet statement should also be viewed in the light of these facts. R. Reagan's reply voices agreement in general, as it were, with particular Soviet theses or intentions with regard to questions of disarmament and security. But the President's positive statements with regard to the Soviet initiatives really drown in various kinds of provisos, "linkages," and "conditions," which in fact block the solution of fundamental questions of disarmament. The reduction of strategic nuclear arsenals is made conditional on the USSR's consent to the "star wars" program and reductions -- unilateral reductions, moreover -- in Soviet conventional weapons. And problems of regional conflicts and also of bilateral relations are tied to this. The elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe is blocked by references to the stance of Britain and France and by demands for Soviet defenses in the east of the country to be weakened while U.S. military strength in that region is maintained. The refusal to end nuclear tests is justified by arguments to the effect that nuclear weapons serve as a "deterrent" factor. In short, the White House chief's reply shows no sign of any serious readiness to really begin solving cardinal problems in removing the nuclear threat.

What is more, in recent days, when world attention has been riveted on the work of the 27th CPSU Congress in Moscow, speeches by President Reagan and other Washington administration representatives have once again openly and cynically voiced the intention to continue the former militarist course. Appearing on national television recently, the White House head praised to the skies the results of the administration's implementation of the long-term program to "modernize America's military strength," He particularly credited himself with creating a new generation of nuclear missile arms: MX ICBM's, the Trident nuclear first-strike submarine missile system, the B-1B and Stealth strategic bombers, and so forth. At the same time, the President tried to portray the matter as though the unrestrained buildup of U.S. military might were necessary for... the success of the talks with the Soviet Union. "Strength," he declared, "is the most convincing argument we have with which to persuade opponents to negotiate seriously."

In his television address the President tried his best to publicize his "new" proposal for medium-range missiles in Europe, which is nothing but a rehash of the notorious "zero option." He once again campaigned for the militarization of space and essentially made acceptance of the "star wars" program a condition for solving the question of reducing strategic arms. At the same time, he made it clear that Washington has not the slightest intention of confining itself to so-called research in the SDI sphere; it is already planning to create [sozdaniye] real space weapons systems without delay.

The U.S. President's radio address, which followed his television address, was also couched in the same spirit. It, too, pursued the aim of preventing a reduction in military spending, which would threaten the profits of the military-industrial complex. Declaring that the United States has made great strides in creating the sound foundations of a powerful and realiable military machine, the President asserted that this work has not yet been completed. "We cannot afford," he said, "to let what we have achieved over the past 5 years to be undermined by incautious budget cuts."

The White House is stubbornly trying to ensure that the military budget for the next fiscal year exceeds this year's budget by almost 12 percent. It is a question of allocating $311.6 billion to the Pentagon. It is planned to increase appropriations for the "star wars" program by 75 percent at once and to raise them to almost $5 billion. Even many congressmen have been shocked by the U.S. militarist circles' excessive appetites. Thus, Senator J. Abdnor declared: "The White House budget planners have lost all sense of reality by proposing huge increases in military spending."

However, this is not the only area in which the Washington administration lacks a sense of reality. With both his speeches the head of the White House tried to justify, imposing on the country a new round of the arms race and continuing the unconstructive and futile strong-arm approach to relations with the Soviet Union. The essence and purport of the course proposed by Washington is to achieve decisive military superiority over the USSR and to be able to threaten to inflict a nuclear first strike.

Top Pentagon officials at once came out in support of the stand taken by the President. Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, for example, publicly claims that "the world has become a safer place" as a result of the implementation of the program for "rearming America" and constantly increasing military spending. Admiral W. Crowe, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, categorically declared that the United States should not stop nuclear tests on 31 March 1986, that is, the date to which the USSR has extended its unilaterally adopted moratorium on all nuclear explosions. Crowe was not ashamed to admit openly that the United States needs to carry out nuclear explosions on a permanent basis to ensure the "reliability and stability" of U.S. arms.

This, up to now, is Washington's reply to the Soviet peace initiatives. However, the powers that be across the ocean ought to fully comprehend the conclusion drawn in the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress: "The military strength, in which the United States puts its trust in order to preserve the status quo, protect the interests of monopolies and the military-industrial complex, and prevent further progressive transformations in liberated countries, can only complicate the situation and give rise to new conflicts."

The policy of total opposition and confrontation, which the U.S. Administration is still trying to pursue, has no future. Soviet policy, which enjoys the ever-increasing support of the world's peoples, organically combines the indefatigable struggle for peace with readiness to deal a firm rebuff to any aggression. In the military sphere the USSR intends to continue to act in such a way that no one need have any grounds for fears, even imagined fears, for his safety. But the Soviet Union and its allies equally want to be rid of a sense of impending threat. As was declared from the high rostrum of the 27th CPSU Congress, the Soviet Union does not lay claim to greater security. It will not agree to less security. Ever!

/8309
CSO: 5200/2288

PRAVDA NOTES MEDIA CRITICISM OF U.S. REPLY ON ARMS

PM261155 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 86 Second Edition p 12

[TASS report: "Propaganda Maneuver"]

[Text] Washington, 25 Feb--A propaganda maneuver designed to disguise the U.S. reluctance to embark on the path of really limiting the arms race and to justify the policy of maintaining and building up nuclear arsenals--this is how U.S. specialists and the press evaluate the White House's response to the large-scale Soviet peace-loving initiative set forth in the statement of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 15 January this year.

"President Reagan declared that the United States is not prepared to examine the Soviet proposal to eliminate all nuclear arms over the next 15 years," reported AP summing up the substance of the American response.

The administration declared that the USSR's proposal to destroy all nuclear weapons by the end of this century is "clearly not suitable for examination at present," THE WASHINGTON POST in turn points out. "Reagan's response contains no new American positions at the talks."

UPI draws attention to the fact that even before the publication of the American response, which came after 6 weeks of "consideration" of the Soviet initiative by Washington, the U.S. press had been "inundated by a veritable flood of leaks and hints, many of which had clearly come from the White House." "The administration hopes to seize the initiative in the sphere of public diplomacy," is how THE WASHINGTON POST explained the ruse involving "leaks" and the American response as a whole.

American observers who had been hopefully expecting the White House to respond in a constructive spirit to the USSR's far-reaching peace program are expressing disappointment and alarm at the fact that Washington's response not only will not facilitate but will still further hamper the search in Geneva for mutually acceptable accords in the sphere of limiting nuclear arms. P. Warnke, one of the leading American specialists in the arms control sphere and former leader of the U.S. delegation in Geneva, pointed to the unbalanced nature of the American proposal and called it "not serious." "It cannot serve as a good basis for continuing the talks," R. (Gartkhof), a staffer at the Brookings Institution and another prominent expert in the disarmament sphere, said.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1288

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS CITES SENATOR KENNEDY ON ARMS AGREEMENTS

LD192242 Moscow TASS in English 2219 GMT 19 Feb 86

[Text] Washington, 19 Feb (TASS)--"It is now possible to outline a series of far-reaching agreements which, with sufficient political will on the part of both sides, can be achieved in the next few years," Senator Edward Kennedy, who recently visited the Soviet Union, writes in THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper.

If the final gaps can be bridged, mutually verifiable agreements can be reached to achieve the following three goals: The removal of all American and Soviet intermediate range nuclear forces from Europe, a halt to all future testing of nuclear weapons, and a drastic reduction in strategic armaments, he points out. "This would be linked to a ban on the development and deployment of space-based anti-ballistic missile defence systems," the senator stresses.

"My believe that such progress can be made is based on my experience as a member of the Senate observer group, which has been monitoring the arms talks in Geneva for the past year, and on my lengthy meetings earlier this month with General Secretary (of the CPSU Central Committee) Mikhail Gorbachev and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze of the Soviet Union," Senator Kennedy goes on.

"There are, of course, other important issues to be resolved before an INF agreement can be signed," he observes. "These are difficult questions, but solutions exist."

"A breakthrough in INF has now occurred, and solutions to these other issues should be immediately explored in Geneva. Gorbachev views INF forces as the most dangerous nuclear flashpoint between our nations, since the missile flight time is so short--under 10 minutes. Removing this flashpoint would be a major step toward arms control."

"In our conversation, Gorbachev also emphasized that the Soviet Union is prepared to enter into an agreement banning all future nuclear testing, without any precondition or requirement of progress in other areas. In fact, he expressed the note that the current unilateral Soviet moratorium would be matched by the United States, and that his country would never again have to conduct a nuclear test," writes Senator Kennedy. The Soviet leaders, he adds, "stressed that they are willing to agree to a range of measures, including on-site inspections, to verify compliance."

"There are many areas where our two countries will continue to be at odds, and major tensions will remain," Senator Kennedy notes. He expresses his belief that Gorbachev shares the view that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. "On that fundamental question, the interests of the Soviet Union and the United States coincides, and important steps are possible in the coming months toward a real and lasting nuclear peace."

/8309
CSO: 5200/1288

USSR 'TOP PRIORITY' ON GORBACHEV CPSU SPEECH, U.S. REACTION

LD271638 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 27 Feb 86

["Weekly" discussion entitled "Top Priority" hosted by Vladimir Posner, with Professors Radomir Bogdanov and Sergey Plekhnov of the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, in a discussion of the political report delivered by Mikhail Gorbachev at the 27th CPSU Congress]

[Text] [Posner] Hello and welcome to "Top Priority." Today on the panel are Professor Radomir Bogdanov and Professor Sergey Plekhanov of the United States and Canada Studies Institute, and I am your host, Vladimir Posner. We go on the air today on day two of the 27th Party Congress, and obviously we will concentrate on the political report made by Mikhail Gorbachev, the general secretary, and in particular on the foreign-policy aspects of that report and those that deal with Soviet-U.S. relations.

One of the first reactions in the West to this report has been that it is extremely critical of the West and of the United States, and that it puts the blame for the difficult situation the world finds itself in on the West. And that the tone is very strict and stringent. What would you say to that?

[Bogdanov] You know, Vladimir, I cannot help but just to disagree with that point of view, because of my mind it's not fair at all. And I am really surprised how, without reading the full text, without studying it, literally speaking, with the pen, you can make such a, such a serious conclusion, that it is too harsh, too strong on the West. I cannot agree with that. You know, to be frank with you, Vladimir, I just concentrated my attention on foreign-policy part of that report, but to be frank with you I'm more interested in the domestic problems, which area lot of that report, but since I knew that we are going to meet with you, then of course naturally we concentrated with my friend Sergey on that. But you know, my first reaction is -- you'll be surprised; maybe our listeners over there will be surprised, too -- that it's really very balanced, very mild, and I would put it like that: It's very realistic, very realistic, in his observations on American foreign policy. I would put it like that: on this incumbent administration and on the policy of the West as a whole, you know.[as heard] And if the other side always says that they have now, since they are in power, a very realistic view of the Soviet Union, why we cannot have a very realistic view of this American Administration and USA policies. That's my point. The second point of mind is that it's very balanced in the sense that given our realistic assessment of this administration, with all the criticism that we have and all the grievances and worries about the policy of this administration, we'd rather concentrate on the positive side of this (?story). We suggest what should be done to improve, really drastically improve. And I believe that the main point of his is that there is objective conditions, mind you, objective conditions for improvement in the Soviet-American relations to such an extent that they can go to really cooperative and mutually beneficial relations between USA and USSR. And if we say that the danger is in the nuclear weapons, in the nuclear war, and the danger is still there and we believe that USA, that this administration is responsible for that, that's our view; and I think that we have a right to have a view. That's our view, you know, It's not [word indistinct] there is nothing outstanding in that.

[Posner] Let's take a look at what the general secretary had to say concerning the letter he had received from President Reagan, which would seem to be a response to the proposals that were made back on 15 January. In a general way I think it could be said that Mikhail Gorbachev was not fully pleased with that letter. What would you say, Professor Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] To put it mildly, he was not very pleased with it, because number one, the basic, you know, the letter contained the basic restatement of the previous American positions on the key issues of arms control and Soviet-American relations in this sphere. It is nice, of course, to see President Reagan restate that the United States is in favor of ridding the earth of nuclear weapons, but that's just a declaration. When it comes to the specific points, like: Why not stop the tests of nuclear weapons, why not eliminate medium-range weapons from Europe, why not foreclose the possibility of arms race moving into space, and the other topical issues -- on all those issues the position of the United States remains the same; and, well, Comrade Gorbachev emphasized that the clarification of the American response is not yet over. The specific details are being discussed and the American side in Geneva, I understand, is clarifying the American position, but at this point the general secretary emphasized that at this point, to the extent that he can judge on the American position, it is not encouraging and it reflects the old faults that existed in the American positions for quite some time.

[Posner] Yesterday one of the American political commentators, I believe it was on CBS, said that he was disappointed by what General Secretary Gorbachev had said in the field of international relations and Soviet-American relations, that specifically he had said nothing new, he had nothing new to say, concerning the Soviet proposal to achieve nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. What would you say to that? My personal reaction was that everything has more or less been said.

[Bogdanov] Yeah, that's my reaction, too, but at the same time, you know, I'm again surprised how serious people can talk in those terms, you know. Number two. Number one: I'm sorry. You have a comprehensive set of proposals. You have some comments -- I believe, very important comments -- on those proposals. For instance, the secretary general said that this is a Soviet, the Soviet program for many years to come. That we'll fight for that program not for this given figure, but for many years to come. What does it mean in practice? It means in practice that that will become a cornerstone -- I mean nuclear disarmament -- of the Soviet foreign policy, for the time being, to the end of this century. That's a very important statement, you know. And if you make, if you are really fair and impartial enough you will see the importance of that for the whole, you know, environment. Then the secretary general has given some specifics on that, you know, he commented on some specific parts of that problem and he called once again upon all the responsible, you know, centers of power in the West to just to look at those proposals, not as a propaganda ploy on the side of the Soviet Union, but as a businesslike program that we really throw on the table for discussion. And I believe if you followed the spirit and letter of his comments on that, you will see that it's a very, it's not a you know, closed program in the sense that that's the, that's the, our, last word and we are not open for some suggestions, discussion, and so on. So it's on the table and we should discuss it, but if you put it in this way: there is nothing new -- then of course there is nothing to discuss. That's the usual Western approach to our initiatives. But I believe the time is too dangerous and too crucial to go along those very used and old lines.

[Plekhanov] Besides, there is -- I would like to make another point. The program of nuclear disarmament was put forward just about a month ago. It's a huge, detailed, complex program. And it took the United States Government just 1 month to come with the initial response to it. So to expect our leadership to come up with another program like that after so short a time would really I think, put into question the seriousness of the first program. It is not done for just public-relations purposes. It's a serious, businesslike document, and a long-term plan. So I'm not really surprised that it was basically a restatement of the program [as heard] and the elaboration and the emphasis, doctrinal emphasis, and so on.

[Posner] Let's take a look at one point, and that is that the general secretary stated that to make the agreement on nonmilitarization of space more feasible, certain concrete results had to be reached in advance. And to make that possible, the Soviet Union was willing to negotiate the issue of medium-range missiles in Europe without in any way linking that to the negotiations on strategic weapons and on space-defense weapons. Now do you consider that to be an important measure? Do you think that it could be indeed conducive to agreement in these key areas?

[Bogdanov] You know, it is not only important measure, this is a very practical, very practical measure in the sense that it's within our reach. He has mentioned two things that are within our reach: He mentioned moratorium on nuclear tests, and European problem with INF, you know. So -- and he put it again very bluntly that we have separated INF from strategic and space weapons. That is, we have opened the way to the agreement. And you know, at the same time he has, briefly but I believe very substantially, he has analyzed President Reagan's answer to our proposal, pointing out that is is again unfair and unbalanced proposals. It is not exactly proposals, you know; it is some contradictions, some restrictions, some, you know, difficulties. For instance, the American side has been linking the abolition of new INF in Europe with the situation in Asian part. And you know, they are doing it, as secretary general put it, trying to just decrease our defense in that part. For they link it with conventional, you know, forces, but again they link it in such a way that we have to go along the way of unilateral conventional disarmament, which is not, of course, acceptable, you know, to us. And some other points, you know. But still we believe -- and he has, he has emphasized it -- that moratorium and INF problems, just, you can, you can strike an agreement on that.

[Posner] I would like to ask you what you think on -- or perhaps let me put it differently -- what the Americans, you are saying, is that they cannot dictate to Great Britain or to France in Europe and tell Great Britain and France to impose a ceiling to freeze or not to accept other kinds of medium-range missiles. Now is that, would you take that as a very serious reason to not accept the Soviet proposal?

[Plekhanov] No, I don't think that this is really a valid argument. It's just searching for escape clauses, for some escape hatches from the problem of nuclear disarmament in Europe. One should try. If the United States obstructs the movement towards making Europe free of nuclear weapons, then of course Britain and France --

especially Britain -- would be an obstacle; and besides, you know, our proposal does not really involve any cuts in British or French nuclear potentials. They -- at the initial stage of this program of nuclear disarmament, they can leave their forces at the given level, at the current level. What is required is that the United States and the Soviet Union remove all of their medium-range missiles from Europe.

[Posner] Yes, but...

[Plenkhanov continues] The only condition, the only condition is that Britain and France not increase their medium-range weapons.

[Posner] What the Americans are saying is that they cannot answer for the British and the French. Now how do we get around that one?

[Plekhanov] But we have proposed to discuss this program with the British and French Governments separately, and there hasn't been a flat rejection of such discussion from either side.

The important thing is that, that there should be willingness to address the program of this nuclear disarmament, that the ceilings of the existing weapons be brought down, not brought up. If I think there is a commitment to that goal on the Western side, then the details can be worked out.

[Bogdanov] And there is another very important point: The circumvention problem, you know. If USA takes an obligation that they would not circumvent the agreement by supplying strategic and INF means to Britain and France, then you will see how the picture will be different from what they are talking about.

[Posner] Yes, now let's go on to another point, and that is the summit. The general secretary very clearly said that for a summit to be possible between the United States and the Soviet Union, there has to be a good reason for it, there has to be a result. Some people are saying in the West that that was a signal that the Soviet Union does not want a summit. How do you feel about that?

[Plekhanov] Well, that's certainly a wrong interpretation. The Soviet Union has always been in favor of talking at the summit level on the issues of security and arms control, and Soviet-American relations and relations with other states; and in this particular setting, of course there is a great willingness to continue the summit process, the dialogue at the summit -- but to continue and to develop it, not just talk for the sake of talking. People in all countries, I think, are expecting progress from further summits. There can be only one summit at which you simply get to know each other and have some initial discussions, and I think it is legitimate to expect that the next summit should bring specific results in the areas where progress is possible. And progress is possible in the area of stopping the nuclear tests and concluding a treaty on banning nuclear tests, and secondly on the question of elimination of INF's from Europe, so it is just, I think, that the statement by Comrade Gorbachev is, should be interpreted as a way of making the summit agenda more specific and inviting the Reagan administration to think about the specifics of the next summit, rather than simply, you know, sort of undermining the idea of a summit.

[Bogdanov] You know, let me state my own view on that -- and I believe maybe my view is not very conventional -- but I believe that without very clear statement from the American side that substantial agreement is possible, no summit to my mind is useful.

Otherwise, it would be a fake summit, in the sense that under the cover of that meeting the Americans' side will go with the, proceed with the arms race, under the cover of that. And I don't understand why we should help them to do that. That's a very wrong thing.

[Plekhanov] That's right.

[Posner] Well, in conclusion, let's look at one final point that was made in the general secretary's political report, and which concerns a comprehensive system of international security and which includes the military area, the political area, the economic area, the humanitarian area. How do you, do you see this as a realistic idea, and how important do you think that whole view actually is for the world today?

[Plekhanov] Vladimir, I believe that this part of secretary's, of the secretary general's report, is so important that we should devote one of our Top Priorities especially for that (?program).

[Posner] Well, let's do it next here.

[Bogdanov] Because, yeah, you know, that's really very positive side of the whole, of the whole foreign-policy part of the report.

[Posner] Next time we will do that, but (?as sort of) briefly [word indistinct].

[Bogdanov] Yes, yes, briefly, briefly, you know, your question is how practical it is. I believe, it is very practical. Why is it very practical? First of all, it covers all the areas of disagreement between us and USA and between East and West. So in these basics -- it is called basics in the report -- the secretary general has accumulated the experience, you know, our mutual experience for, maybe, for the last decade or two decades. That's number one. Number two: It takes into consideration not only traditional areas of basics between East and West, you say in USSR like military, like political, [as heard] it takes into consideration human aspects of our relations based on our experience, you know, including the family, including human rights, and all that, you know. Then maybe for the first time it's very, it very seriously has been considering the economical aspects of the basics, because in the present environment, economic relations between East and West, between the so-called South and North, you know, become of overall importance, you know. If you keep in mind debt problem and all that, you know. So and my third point is that the solutions we suggest -- and I hope we will be talking about that next time -- are very realistic and very practical, and it's really what it is called in the, what is called in the report a new approach, a new thinking, in the foreign policy area, you know. That's why I believe that it is very practical, it is very important, and maybe one time, all of us -- I mean West, East, USA, USSR -- will come to discuss it very thoroughly and try to find out, if you like, legal, you know, expression of the basics on a mutual basis, something like that.

[Posner] Well thank you very much, Dr Bogdanov, Dr Plekhanov. I think we have our work cut out for us next time; we will be discussing this idea of international security, and until then this is Vladimir Posner saying goodbye on behalf of the team of "Top Priority," until next week.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2288

CPSU CONGRESS REAFFIRMS USSR COMMITMENT TO DISARMAMENT

LD080212 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 7 Mar 86

[Commentary bv Georgiy Sturua]

[Text] The 27th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party held in Moscow has reiterated the call to the United States and other Western powers to approach the key problem in world politics, the problem of war or peace, from a responsible stance. Georgiy Sturua of our staff has written the following commentary.

Under present day conditions the security of states can only be universal, for a nuclear war would threaten everybody. It would spare no country, big or small. If one speaks of security in regard to the Soviet Union and the United States, then this security can only be the same and mutual. Gone are the days when it was possible to calculate what side would suffer greater losses in a war and what side less losses. Scientists have convincingly proved that it is impossible to survive nuclear warfare. Those men and women and children who survive in it will inevitably die from the cold and darkness of the nuclear winter. Once such a situation has come about in the world then one can only deduce the following: In order to survive a reliable system of security has to be established and set up, not with the help of new kinds of weapons on earth or in outer space, but with the help of political means. This precisely is what the Soviet Union proposes doing.

The new Soviet proposals on nuclear disarmament and on improving international relations are the very vehicles for setting up a system of parity and security. Moscow proceeds from the premise that less security for the United States, in comparison with the Soviet Union, would not be profitable for our country. What is needed here is precisely parity. But what do we hear in answer to this from Washington? The unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions that has been in force in the Soviet Union for already 7 months has not been reciprocated by the American Administration.

The Soviet proposal on the stage-by-stage elimination of all nuclear weapons by the end of the century has been announced by the White House as an untimely proposal. With this the program for nuclear rearmament and the so-called star wars is being stepped up. And President Reagan has time and again called for a policy from positions of strength.

One gets the impression that the gentlemen in Washington are simply afraid of the possibility that has arisen for improving Soviet-American relations. Certain people there apparently would like to freeze and to perpetuate the dangerous situtation of nuclear confrontation. In this connection Mikhail Gorbachev has posed the question, then what should we do. Should we bang the door? It is quite possible that this is what we are wanted to do. However, we perfectly understand our responsibility for the destiny of our country, for the destiny of the world, the Soviet leader said in Moscow yesterday, and this is why we do not intend to play into the hands of those people who would like to force the world to live with the nuclear threat, to live with the arms race. The Soviet foreign policy is oriented at a search for mutual understanding, for dialogue, for the (?assertion) of peaceful co-existence. The congress of the Communist Party has confirmed that the Soviet Union intends persistently to work for the elimination of the nuclear arsenals, for a radical curbing of the arms race, for building reliable, equal for all states, international security.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2288

USSR'S KARPOV INTERVIEWED ON PROSPECTS FOR GENEVA TALKS

LD061557 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 6 Mar 86

[Interview with V.P. Karpov, leader of USSR delegation to Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons, by correspondent, V. Dmitriyev, in Geneva; date not given; recorded--from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As has already been reported, another round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons has ended in Geneva.

[Dmitriyev] This was the first meeting of diplomats and experts of the USSR and United States since the Soviet-U.S. summit talks in Geneva, at which it was decided to step up the dialogue on nuclear and space weapons. And it is no coincidence that the world press and international public followed the latest round with increased attention. Here is the final plenary session. [video shows delegates at table] Can it be asserted that the cause is moving forward? We asked the leader of the Soviet delegation, Comrade Karpov, to comment on the results of the latest round.

[Karpov] The Soviet delegation built its work at this fourth round of talks with the United States on nuclear and space weapons around the large-scale programs for nuclear disarmament formulated in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's statement of 15 January. The USSR delegation exerted maximum efforts to pave the way to a businesslike, practical discussion of these issues, having in mind -- considering the bilateral character of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations -- above all the achievement of an accord on 50 percent cuts in the appropriate nuclear arms of the USSR and the United States.

As a separate solution, we proposed to the United States that we eliminate Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, which could pave the way toward more far-reaching solutions concerning nuclear disarmament. It has to be said that we did not find the necessary understanding on the part of the U.S. delegation, which just as before would not agree to move on to a serious, businesslike discussion aimed at working out mutually acceptable solutions. The tasks formulated at the meeting between President Reagan and the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in November -- namely, the prevention of an arms race in space and a halt to the one on earth -- must be solved by joint efforts. Naturally, the delegation of the Soviet Union is making every effort to this end. It is now up to the U.S. delegation, which must prove by its deeds that it intends to fulfill those joint accords which were achieved at the Geneva meeting.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2288

TOWER RESIGNATION FROM GENEVA DELEGATION NOTED BY TASS

LD121551 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1049 GMT 12 Mar 86

[Text] Washington, 12 Mar (TASS) -- John Tower, member of the U.S. delegation at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva and head of the group on strategic weapons, has resigned. The White House has announced that President Reagan will accept Tower's resignation, and that it had not been caused by "political disagreements."

According to the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST, Tower, a well-know "hawk" and former senator, had been aiming to become U.S. Secretary of Defense. He regarded his post in Geneva as a "launching pad" on his way to the Pentagon. Underlying Tower's decision, the newspaper notes, "is a realization of the fact that Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger has no intention of leaving his post." Ronald Lehman, special assistant to the president for national security, is supposed to succeed him. He, the newspaper writes, referring to opinion in Washington official circles, will secure the succession in this post.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2288

CPSU SECURITY POLICY COMBATS 'NUCLEAR MADNESS'

PM121500 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Mar 86 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Colonel V. Yeshchenko, candidate of philosophical sciences, under the rubric "Policy of Peace Versus Policy of War": "The Alternative to Nuclear Madness"]

[Text] The Archimedes' lever of revolutionary upheaval in the history of international relations -- that is how the world public has rated the CPSU's foreign policy strategy as set out in the new edition of the CPSU Program and in the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress. Having set itself the task of completely eliminating weapons of mass destruction before the end of the century, the Soviet Union gives the world community the sought-after "point of support, which offers mankind a fundamentally new area of development and the opportunity to concentrate on creation alone.

The attainment of this humanitarian goal is of vital interest to all the peoples of the world, which in its history has experienced thousands of wars, more than 100 of which have taken place in the second half of this century alone. At present the fires of more than 40 armed conflicts and wars are raging in the world. Each day they take thousands of human lives.

But the most awesome danger for the world's population is presented by the threat of nuclear war, which is capable of eliminating the human race from the face of the earth. There is no task more important or urgent now than halting the material preparation for such a war and halting the arms race. There is no more noble or uniting aim than saving mankind from the nuclear trap. For that reason, the 27th CPSU Congress stressed, the main thrust of the party's activity in the world arena for the future will continue to be the struggle against the nuclear danger and the arms race and for preserving and strengthening universal peace.

Analyzing the character and scale of the nuclear threat, our party formulated at the Central Committee April (1985) plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress the credo of political realism in the nuclear and space age. Its main tenets are as follows:

First, the character of modern weapons offers no state the hope of defending itself by military-technical means alone. No defense, whether with ground-based or space-based elements, "extensive" or "regional," or using even the most "exotic" technologies, guarantees anyone invulnerability in the event of nuclear conflict. Nor can real security be ensured by the doctrines of "containment" or "deterrence," which effectively transform the whole world into nuclear hostages.

On this basis, our party believes that it is necessary to radically revise the methodological approach to the solution of security problems and shift the stress from the military-technical sphere to the political sphere. Ensuring security requires the bold and resolute choice of political methods as the main and decisive means of preventing global nuclear conflict. The only acceptable basis of the concept of ensuring universal security now is not the buildup of the nuclear arsenals but their verifiable phased reduction, the limitation of the extent of "nuclear geography," and the complete elimination of the nuclear infrastructure and weapons of mass destruction.

Second, the CPSU has reached the conclusion that a new quality of security must be taken into account when dealing with the main question of the present day -- preventing nuclear war and ensuring reliable peace.

In relations between the USSR and the United States security can only be mutual, and in international relations only universal. That is also being said by sober-minded politicians in the West. "No matter what efforts the superpowers make, either in the military or technical sphere," Hoopes, former U.S. Air Force deputy secretary and chairman of the National Security Council believes, "none of those powers will be able to substantially alter the current balance of forces. The fact is that we will either coexist with the Russians or perish together with them. We have a common security problem."

Recognition of the need for mutual and universal security as a real fact of our times would help the United States and its NATO allies to renounce the concept of "mutual assured destruction" and promote their more active participation in the search for ways to build Soviet-U.S. relations in particular and international relations in general in accordance with the concept of "universal assured survival," as the Soviet Union urges.

Third, the 27th CPSU Congress documents contain an objective assessment of the causes of the war danger in the modern era. The United States and its military-industrial complex continue to be the engine of militarism. Reactionary militarist circles in the United States try to justify the arms race without going beyond their usual range of anticommunist doctrines and prejudices on the pretext, as Secretary of State Shultz said, that the "Soviet Union continues to pose a threat to the interests and ideals of the United States and the free world." In actual fact, this is a matter of U.S. imperialism's imperial ambitions and its desire for social revenge.

Fourth, political realism is inseparable from a sober assessment of the processes of world development and from the ability to see things without prejudice or blinders (anti-Soviet, anti-U.S., and so forth). The times urgently demand an end to the simplified view of a world, in the process of rapid change, as an "arena of struggle between good and evil," embodied in the first instance in the form of "America, chosen by God" and in the second as the "godless empire of the USSR." The moving force of social changes in the world is the class struggle for social progress and national liberation.

In a civilized world it is impermissible to wield the "big military fist," albeit disguised, according to Pentagon chief Weinberger, in the "kid gloves of diplomacy," or to "punish" entire peoples for "disobedience." Nowadays, in the nuclear age, the ethics of international communications demand the strict observance of all sovereign states' legitimate interests. Everyone, particularly the nuclear powers, must know how to behave with restraint and circumspection and live in a civilized manner.

In this connection the 27th CPSU Congress paid great attention to the problem of the psychological restructuring of international relations. Its essence consists in moving from bellicosity, which has built up over the centuries, and from modes of thought and action based on the acceptability and permissiblity of wars and armed conflicts, to peaceful coexistence among states with different social systems. The objective historical preconditions for that have come about. That is why for the Soviet Union peaceful coexistence is not a short-term policy of convenience, but the basis of a foreign policy strategy. Soviet military doctrine is also formed in full accordance with the spirit and letter of this strategy. Its defensive character gives no one grounds to fear for their security, even imaginary fear.

At the same time, it is common knowledge that scenarios exist in the West for a nuclear attack on the USSR and the Warsaw Pact countries. The United States has a Single Integrated Operation Plan (SIOP-6) for conducting combat operations during a "large-scale" strategic war, which envisages nuclear strikes being delivered against 40,000 targets in the socialist and developing countries.

NATO has formulated a corresponding "duplicate" of that plan, the so-called regional "plan of combat operations using nuclear weapons" (NOP), which envisages the nuclear bombing of between 18 and 25 targets (mainly economic and industrial) in the European part of the USSR and on the territory of other Warsaw Pact countries.

When putting forward its nuclear disarmament program, the CPSU proceeds from the premise that it is now impossible to win the arms race and that the striving for military superiority cannot bring political advantages to any side. The USSR lays no claims to greater security, but neither will it accept diminished security. The military-political situation which has taken to fulfill their containing role.

The military-strategic equilibrium existing between the USSR and the United States and the Warsaw Pact and NATO represents an equal danger to the opposing sides. According to U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, the United States "for the next 100 years has 10 times more warheads than it needs to be sure of destroying that society" (the USSR). But the Soviet Union also has all it needs to firmly rebuff any aggressor. Consequently, the continuation of the nuclear arms race and, even more, its extension to space, loses its practical purpose. Reliance on "over armament" can only increase the equal danger to the point where even parity cases to be a factor of military-political containment.

However, in the West and above all in the United States, militarist circles continue stubbornly aiming at the attainment of military superiority over the USSR. And contrary to common sense they even assert that the more nuclear weapons there are, the better it is for peace and the more effectively they help to "prevent" a third world war. Such distorted logic can only be called the very essence of nuclear madness. Nevertheless, the Pentagon's documents sent to Congress along with the fiscal 1987 budget say: "The restoration of America's military might represents a new definition of the conditions of Soviet-U.S. relations. The United States is now beginning to act from a position of strength. In fact, it is the only way of holding effective talks."

The star wars program that is being implemented by the Pentagon represents a particular danger in this context. Washington makes no secret of the fact that a basic aim of this program is to seize the strategic commanding heights. Dominance in space makes it possible to secure dominance on earth. The star wars program is a strategy for the enslavement of the peoples and their subordination to imperialist diktat.

The Soviet Union warns that transferring the arms race to space will accelerate the already critically high pace of the stockpiling and improvement of nuclear and other types of weapons and will be an insuperable obstacle on the path to radical disarmament. From the rostrum of the 27th party congress a stern warning was issued to the space adventurists with their illusory schemes, and at the same time a readiness was expressed to do everything to prevent the militarization of space.

The CPSU's foreign policy course of destroying the means of mass extermination and of averting the war danger, a course formulated at the 27th party congress, is a convincing alternative to nuclear madness. It inspires the confidence that no matter how great the threat to peace created by the policy of imperialism's aggressive circles, there is no fatal inevitability of world war. But it is necessary to struggle to ensure firm peace and freedom, to achieve success in the fight against war, a success which will be a historic victory for all mankind and every person on our planet.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2288

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA OBSERVER OVCHINNIKOV VIEWS SECURITY ISSUES, PROCESS

PM101939 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Mar 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov: "Security in the Nuclear Age"]

[Text] The 27th CPSU Congress decisions convincingly demonstrated the indivisibility of socialism and peace and the historical mission of the Land of the Soviets as the standardbearer of the forces called upon to deliver mankind from nuclear suicide.

Imperialism has not given up its obsession with perpetuating its domination and disregarding the progressive march of history. But nuclear confrontation imposes new forms of mutual relations between states and social systems. A dangerous gulf has arisen between the realities of the age and the stereotypes of political thinking. The treat of the destruction of all living things awakens in manking the forces of self-preservation and creates favorable preconditions for constructive, creative collaboration among countries and peoples on a plant-wide scale. The combination of the historical confrontation between the two systems and the growing interdependence of the states of the world community is a manifestation of the dialectics of present-day world development. Objective conditions have arisen in the international arena in which the confrontation between capitalism and socialism can only, exclusively take the forms of peaceful competition and peaceful revalry.

"The nuclear danger has equalized states in one respect: In a major war nobody can stand on the sidelines or warm his hands at someone else's misfortune," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in his speech at the closing of the congress. "Identical security is an imperious command of the times. Ensuring that security is increasingly becoming a political task which can be resolved only by political means. It is time to build relations between states on a more lasting foundation than that of weapons."

The modern world has become too fragile for strong-arm policies. It can only be saved and preserved by breaking with the age-old ideas of the acceptability and permissibility of wars and armed conflicts. The nuclear age makes us rethink the very philosophy of politics. Whereas before, a win for one side usually meant a defeat for the other, today security for the USSR and the United States can only be mutual; and for international relations in general, it can only be universal. It cannot be ensured at the expense of or too the detriment of the other side.

Nor can you eternally go on building security on the fear of retribution. The doctrines of "restraint" or "deterrence" not only make the entire world the captive of chance, but encourage the arms race, which could sooner or later get out of control. The present level of military confrontation only guarantees each side equal danger, but if it is raised even higher, parity itself will cease to be a restraining factor. True equal security is guaranteed in our age not by an extremely high level, but by an extremely low level of the strategic balance, from which it is necessary entirely to exclude nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction.

The mutual commitment adopted by the USSR and U.S. leaders at the Geneva meeting not to seek military superiority meets the interests of both states' security. Conversely, any attempt to wreck the strategic parity is fraught with the risk of exacerbating military revalry, which offers only an additional threat to each side.

Soviet military doctrine is based on the fact that the USSR is an opponent of nuclear war in any form and that it will adhere strictly to the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. We are in favor of confining military potential within the limits of a reasonable sufficiency. But the nature and level of those limits depend on the actions of the United States and its partners in the blocs. The Soviet Union does not lay claim to greater security, but will not accept lesser security.

Mankind has reached a turning point where he must make a choice: Either overcome the inertia of the past, when security was seen first and foremost from the standpoint of strength, or remain a hostage to the arms race -- the race for nuclear, chemical, and in the future other equally terrible weapons. This choice between what reason suggests and what leads to catastrophe must be bold and responsible. It is too late for the half-hearted solutions that slowed down the arms race in certain avenues while it forged ahead with redoubled force in others. The time has come to take major steps together toward ridding the planet of the mountains of weapons and toward ensuring that security for each one means security for all.

The centerpiece of the Soviet Union's foreign policy in the years to come will be the struggle to implement the program put forward in the 15 January statement of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Its main point must be the phased elimination of nuclear weapons, so as to make it possible, by the end of this century, finally and irreversibly to remove the sword of Damocles which has hung over the people since the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

This historical task can be resolved in only one way -- the direct way: by eliminating the nuclear weapons themselves. Attempts to create the notorious "space shield" would only spur on the arms race and make it irreversible. We cannot allow the "star wars" program to be used as a barrier in the path of radical disarmament. Seeking to help overcome this obstacle, the Soviet Union has expressed readiness to resolve the question of medium-range missiles in the European zone separately, without direct links with the problems of strategic arms in space. If it was possible, without delaying or complicating the matter with other problems, to eliminate the Soviet and American missiles in Europe, that would untie one of the complex knots in world politics and clear the way for the radical reduction of nuclear weapons and then for their complete elimination.

In the nuclear age we cannot live according to the customs of the Stone Age, when the main concern was to get hold of a bigger stick or a heavier stone. Relying wholly on military force. as people have done for centuries and millenia, means pushing mankind toward nuclear self-destruction. Unfortunately, precisely this gulf between political thinking and the realities of the age is demonstrated by the U.S. Administration's response to the Soviet proposals, a response accompanied by calls for the still more energetic buildup of military muscle. "Strength is the most convincing argument we have. We will not deprive America of its trump card at the negotiating table with the Soviet Union -- these words from the U.S. President illustrate Washington's political philosophy.

It is hard to find in the response to the Soviet initiatives or in recent public statements by the U.S. leadership any serious willingness to resolve in practice the cardinal problems of removing the nuclear threat. In the opinion of the White House incumbent, the program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons is "an unsuitable topic for discussion at the present time." This idea is fenced about with "conditions" and "linkages." First, they say, it is necessary to eliminate the imaginary inequality in conventional arms, to settle regional conflicts on U.S. terms, to "change the behavior" of the Soviet Union in the international arena. The radical reduction of strategic arsenals is made conditional on our consent to the "star wars" program.

The elimination of nuclear weapons in Europe is blocked by references to the position of Britain and France. Here too they artificially drag in questions of the military balance in Asia, whose practical resolution is provided for at the relevant stage in the Soviet program. The U.S. ruling circles' reluctance to embark on the path of nuclear disarmament is manifested most clearly in connection with the question of nuclear explosions, an end to which is demanded by the whole world.

It is clear that the United States still has people who lay claim to a special security adapted to suit them alone. Calls for strength, which is still regarded as the most convincing argument in world politics, remain current in Washington. It seems some people are simply afraid of the opportunity which has emerged for a major, long-term thaw in Soviet-U.S. relations and in the international situation in general.

Militarist, aggressive circles would prefer to freeze and perpetuate confrontation. How should the USSR respond to this? By indignantly slamming the door? The possibility is not ruled out that that is precisely what they want to push us into. But Soviet Communists are aware of their responsibility for the country's future and the future of the world. Therefore they do not intend to play into the hands of those who are trying to make mankind learn to live with the nuclear threat, with the arms race. The USSR's foreign policy is oriented toward the quest for mutual understanding, toward dialogue, toward the establishment of peaceful coexistence as the universal norm in relations between states.

"The party," the new edition of the CPSU Program says, "will seek the development of the process of relaxation of international tension, regarding it as a natural and necessary stage along the path toward the creation of an all-embracing and reliable security system."

The idea of creating an all-embracing system of international security, whose fundamental principles in the military, political, economic, and humanitarian spheres were formulated at the 27th CPSU Congress, has met with the widest response throughout the world. In the military sphere this system is based on the renunciation by the nuclear powers of war against each other or against third states -- either nuclear or conventional. It is based on the need to prevent an arms race in space, to stop all nuclear weapons tests and entirely eliminate those weapons, to ban and destroy chemical weapons, and to renounce other weapons of mass destruction. It is proposed to lower, under strict control, the level of states' military budgets proportionately and commensurately.

The 27th CPSU Congress appealed to all governments, parties, and public organizations that are really concerned for the future of peace on earth, to all peoples, to cooperate still more closely in resisting the threat of war. International reaction is by no means omnipotent. The development of the world revolutionary process and the upsurge of mass democratic and antiwar movements have considerably widened and strengthened the tremendous potential of peace, reason, and good will, a potential which acts as a mighty counterweight to imperialism's aggressive policy.

Nuclear catastrophe must be averted. We can and must build a world of good-neighborliness, in which each people holds a worthy place respected by others. The Soviet Union seeks precisely such a secure world.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2288

PRAVDA REVIEWS PETROVSKIY BOOK ON NUCLEAR WAR, ARMS CONTROL

PM201447 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 86 Seciond Edition p 4

[A. Ivkin review under the "Among Books" rubric: "Averting the Threat"]

[Text] Mankind, which is acquiring enormous power over the forces of nature as a result of the scientific and technical revolution, has at the same time found itself faced with the threat of self-destruction. The harnessing of the power of the atom and man's ascent into space could help make all peoples prosperous. The politicians of imperialist powers, and above all the United States, however, have exploited these events to build up an unprecedented threat to the earth's civilization. Is this sword of Damocles really destined to fall? is the question that diplomat and historian V.F. Petrovskiy poses in his recently published book. (Footnote) (V.F. Petrovskiy. "Security in the Nuclear Space Age." ("Bezopasnost v Yaderno-Kosmicheskuyu Eru.") International Relations Publishing House Moscow, 1985.)

In other words, "will there be nuclear war or not?" It is impossible to give an unambiguous answer. The author's argument that, given the present military strategic parity, the only guarantee for the security of each state lies in their mutual, collective security is convincing. Recognition of this postulate, which was reflected in the Soviet-American joint statement at the Geneva summit meeting, enables one to hold that the likelihood of preventing nuclear war is greater than the likelihood of its breaking out. The threat of war does, however, remain. The reason being the stubborn reluctance of the U.S. military-industrial complex and the Washington Administration to renounce the implementation of the "star wars" preparation program.

Sometimes he is "just a human being," giving vent to his emotions, who addresses the reader. But in the main we are presented with the reflections of a specialist equipped with in-depth knowledge of the mechanisms of diplomacy. He provides a detailed analysis of the system of security guarantees, disarmament measures, the role played by the United Nations, international talks, and unilateral and multilateral acts by states, and the influence of social forces on strengthening security.

The book allocates much space to the USSR's consistent struggle for arms reduction and limitation and disarmament. This struggle is dictated by the sense of supreme responsibility felt by the CPSU and the Soviet state for the fate of mankind and its peaceful future. The new Soviet peace initiatives proposed by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his 15 January statement were also dictated by an appreciation of that responsibility.

The book's conclusion that there is no fatal inevitability to war is comprehensively backed up. The book convincingly demonstrates that the people's desire for peace, the awareness of all states' political leaders of the enormous responsibility for their decisions, and the bringing of political thinking into line with the realities of the nuclear space age are capable of preventing the planet from reaching a "point of no return."

/8309
CSO: 5200/1288

USSR LITERARY PAPER ON PROBLEMS OF SECURITY, PEACE

PM051135 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 5 Mar 86 pp 9, 14

[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political observer Fedor Burlatskiy article: "The Political Philosophy of a Secure Peace"]

[Text] A political philosophy of peace and a platform of concrete actions -- that is how the progressive international public assesses the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th congress. The program put forward at the congress for the total elimination of weapons of mass destruction by the end of this century opens up for mankind a new phase of development -- without wars and without the arms race, a phase of genuinely peaceful cooperation and progress for all the peoples.

Mankind has now reached a completely new stage in his development. For the first time a real threat of self-destruction has arisen. In a sense, the scientific and technical revolution has considerably outstripped the peoples' social development. It burst upon a world divided into two systems and burdened with acute economic, social, political, and ideological contradictions. This had grave and in some cases dramatic consequences. Human society as a whole was unprepared for the reasonable, fair, and exclusively humane application of the achievements of science and technology.

The dialectics of war and peace in our age state that capitalism can no longer resolve the problem of war by itself, while socialism cannot yet resolve the problem of peace by itself. What is the solution? The solution proposed by our party at its 27th congress is to learn the art of living together and to resolve together the problem of preventing a world thermonuclear war. This problem must be resolved in the present-day conditions -- the conditions of competition, rivalry, and cooperation between the two world systems.

As the Political Report says, we face a task of a fundamental nature: Without closing our eyes to social, political, and ideological contradictions, we must master the science and art of conducting ourselves in the international arena with restraint and circumspection and of living in a civilized fashion -- that is, in conditions of scrupulous international intercourse and cooperation.

The fundamental principles of an all-embracing system of international security include: the renunciation by the nuclear powers of war against each other or against third states, both nuclear and conventional war; the prevention of an arms race in space; the ending of all tests of nuclear weapons and their complete elimination; the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons; the renunciation of the creation of other means of mass destruction; unconditional respect, in international practice, for every people's right to exercise a sovereign choice of the paths and forms of their development; and many other important principles. Particular significance is attached to the development of cooperation in the economic and humanitarian spheres, the pooling of efforts in the exploration and peaceful use of space, and the resolution of global problems on which the future of civilization depends.

The Soviet Union's proposed package of new foreign policy initiatives is designed to ensure that mankind greets the year 2000 under a peaceful sky and space, that he no longer fears the nuclear, chemical, or any other threat of destruction, and that he is firmly confident of his own survival and the continuation of the human race.

And what political philosophy of war and peace, what platform of concrete actions does the West offer us? In this respect President R. Reagan's statement, made the other day in response to M.S. Gorbachev's 15 January statement, is noteworthy.

The President deals first of all with the concept set forth by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, our plan for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of this century. R. Reagan stated that the ultimate goal of the United States is to move to the total elimination of nuclear weapons as soon as possible. However, this statement was basically canceled out by numerous reservations.

The "preliminary" condition for the transition to a world without nuclear weapons is stated to be the resolution of a whole range of problems which exist in international relations, including the problems of overcoming reciprocal claims against each other, suspicions, and accusations. Of course, we ourselves are well aware that the foundations of security in the modern world presuppose radical changes in the military, political, economic, and humanitarian spheres. But agreement must be reached in principle on our objective: through joint efforts to achieve -- not all at once, but gradually, by stages -- the elimination of those weapons which could destroy the whole human race. What is preventing the nuclear powers even now from declaring this to be the main objective of all world policy? Incidentally, that is precisely how the task has been formulated in many UN decisions and proposals from the international public.

Speaking on national television, President Reagan stated that the administration will not allow any cuts in the rate of increase of the military budget either in this fiscal year or in the next. Extolling the results of the administration's long-term program for "updating America's military might," which has already cost a trillion dollars, the President boasted particularly of the creation in the United States of such new generations of weapons as the MX first-strike ballistic missile, the Trident system, the B-1B and Stealth bomber, and the emplacement of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles on the territory of West European countries.

"Preparing for war is one of the most effective ways of preserving peace," the President claimed. "Strength is the most convincing argument we possess for persuading our opponents to conduct talks seriously. Now that we are sitting at the negotiating table with the Soviet Union, let us not deprive America of its trump card."

The President's unconstructive position is rejected in the United States itself. Here is a characteristic example. After fierce debates, the U.S. Congress House of Representatives approved by 268 votes to 148 a resolution calling on the administration immediately to resume talks with a view to concluding a treaty on a general and complete nuclear test ban.

It also recommends the President to send to the Senate for ratification the treaties on limiting underground nuclear weapons tests and the treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The adoption of the resolution was a major defeat for the administration.

"This resolution," Congressman E. Markey noted, "calls on the President to stop testing nuclear-excited x-ray lasers, one of the key components of the 'star wars' program." The administration, he went on, is opposed to a general and complete halt to nuclear tests because it wants to acquire Trident-2 enhanced-yield ballistic missiles and other new-generation nuclear weapons. The time has come to tear off the propaganda veil with which the opponents of a general and complete nuclear test ban treaty shroud their arguments.

"On careful examination, these claims collapse like a house of cards," he stressed. E. Markey noted particularly that the question of verification of the observance of such a treaty is no longer an obstacle to its conclusion.

The American press more and more frequently criticizes the White House's strong-arm policy, contrasting it to our country's constructive approach.

THE WASHINGTON POST writes that President Reagan marshalled a whole series of hackneyed stories and arguments in support of his call for an increase in arms spending. Experience shows that some of them are either dubious or simply not in accordance with reality.

Reagan stated, for instance, that his administration's support for the MX missile, the Trident submarine, and other nuclear programs "was the first step toward a substantial improvement in America's strategic means of deterrence in 20 years. [quotemarks as published] But the building of five of the seven Trident submarines began before Reagan became President in 1981. During the "decade of neglect in the seventies," the United States added more strategic nuclear warheads to its arsenal than the Soviet Union.

Reagan also stated that he inherited a country which has suffered from "many years of defense spending cuts." But Defense Department documents show that the total expenditure increased steadily from fiscal 1976. Characteristically, in the last 5 years the number of people supporting the idea of increasing military spending fell from 72 to 22 percent, according to polls carried out by THE WASHINGTON POST and ABC.

The advancement of the fundamental principles of security and universal peace is capable immediately of strengthening the influence of sound, reasonable principles on all problems of international relations. Yes, experience has already shown to a sufficient degree that the implementation of a radical disarmament program is a matter of exceptional complexity and is highly crucial. But what other option is available to mankind?

Of course, we are not suggesting that Western countries simply borrow our socialist philosophy of peace and security. But we have proposed making joint efforts to formulate a new concept of peace and in this spirit to change our relations. And that means joint efforts, together, once both sides are convinced that war between them would mean death.

The truth, a new way of thinking is now needed, to unite rather than disunite the peoples of West and East, to unite all mankind. As for preliminary conditions, the main requirement is once and for all to renounce the philosophy and mentality of hatred, hostility, suspicion, and distrust.

The political philosophy of peace proposed to all governments and peoples by the 27th CPSU Congress is an important step along that path for the sake of the triumph of that simple, indisputable, and difficult right of every person -- the right to life.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2288

USSR'S ZAGLADIN CITES U.S. 'OBSTACLES' AT ARMS TALKS

NC081039 Paris AFP in English 1030 GMT 8 Mar 86

[Excerpts] Moscow, March 8 (AFP) -- A Kremlin spokesman today blamed Washington for the lack of progress in the Geneva arms talks and said that the U.S. Administration wanted to "keep missiles in Europe at any price." Vadim Zagladin, in an interview with AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE, also criticised President Ronald Reagan's response to a proposal by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of the century. President Reagan's conditions for the plan had "practically ruled out any progress" towards this end, he said.

The fourth round of the Geneva arms talks ended Tuesday with little sign of progress in the negotiations. Mr. Zagladin said that the main obstacle in talks on strategic weapons was the proposed U.S. space-based defence, the Strategic Defence Initiative, while agreement regarding medium range missiles would be "easier" although President Reagan's position had made progress unlikely. The Soviet Union had also proposed reductions in conventional weapons, but the West had not made "concrete proposals" in reply, Mr. Zagladin said.

Mr. Zagladin also said that Moscow wanted a superpower summit this year and denied there were any "preconditions", although he said some progress in disarmament talks should be made beforehand. He said that apart from medium range missiles in Europe the most likely source of agreement would be a nuclear test ban.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, in an opening speech to the just finished 27th Soviet Communist Party Congress, said this year's summit should be linked to tangible progress in the Geneva arms talks, an assertion Washington has rejected. Moscow has suggested the second Reagan-Gorbachev summit take place in September or October, which Washington has said is too close to U.S. congressional elections. The White House wants the summit in June or July.

Mr. Zagladin said that "before the second summit, at least some of the problems should be resolved" in the arms field. The Kremlin did not want the summit to comprise discussions on "abstract" issues.

/8309
CSO: 5200/2288

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

ITALIAN DEFENSE OFFICIAL COMMENTS ON GORBACHEV SPEECH

PM031413 Rome AVANTI! in Italian 1 Mar 86 p 7

[Under Secretary of Defense Silvano Signori article: "Difficult Path To Be Pursued Without Haste: Consistent Negotiations Without Concessions for the Sake of Peace"]

[Text] Several international observers have tried to compare Gorbachev to John F. Kennedy, stressing that whereas the latter talked about "new frontiers" for America, the former is talking about "new frontiers" for the world.

Certainly Gorbachev's policy report to the 27th CPSU Congress reveals the desire for a reappraisal of the entire world situation, failing which the point of no return might be reached. So Gorbachev's report reveals a desire for dynamism, for an acceleration of economic change, for a change in party's working methods, and for the international detente process. Gorbachev's statements call for a new boost to peaceful coexistence, with an apparently sincere emphasis on the path of total disarmament before the end of the century.

The path is neither short nor easy. It began at the end of the sixties, when the United States and the USSR started talking about strategic nuclear weapons control and pledged (in the SALT 1 Treaty of 1972) not to deploy huge networks of antimissile missiles that would have forced both superpowers into an appalling race to build more and more sophisticated and numerous offensive and defensive weapons.

Over the years we have learned some valuable lessons which we must now put to use. First, it is now clear to everyone that arms control and East-West detente cannot exist in isolation from the rest of the world It is impossible to get along fine in Europe as if there were nothing wrong while a cruel war of occupation that is in progress in Afghanistan or that there are threats to the security of other European and non-European peoples' independence.

A second lesson learned from experience is not to aim at quick and overly circumscribed negotiations. Accords cannot happen quickly because it is necessary not only to find a compromise between the various governments' demands but also to reach a compromise within each individual country: Indeed, any limitation also entails some change (often substantial) in the country's military planning and in certain groups' economic and political interests. But above all it is necessary always to bear in mind the strategic frame of reference within which reductions take place. No weapons system can be considered in isolation from its strategic context, from the use for which it is intended in relation to other systems, or from the political role it plays within the context of the alliance. The SALT II accord underestimated, for instance, the problems of medium-range nuclear weapons in relation to strategic weapons and this caused a major problem in terms of the effectiveness of NATO's strategy that was only resolved with the Euromissiles' deployment.

The dialogue between the superpowers must not, therefore, lead to concessions, but neither must it be interrupted. No agreement can work unless it is in both sides' interests. However, it is also necessary to avoid adhering stubbornly to a spiral of continuous refusals and rebuffs, which can only help the "hawks" on both sides.

Obviously everything is dependent on the Soviet willingness to accept the principle that the security of Western Europe and the West cannot be sacrificed unilaterally, without equivalent Soviet trade-offs. But in order to attain this objective it is also possible to pursue the path of political imagination and autonomous initiative: No one can question our determination to defend Europe and NATO. But no one must question our desire for peace and disarmament.

We defend the balance of forces but we are also working actively for arms control, to keep the prospects of balanced and controlled disarmament open, to combat nuclear weapons proliferation, to banish the specter of chemical and biological weapons, and to restore the political conditions that will permit a real and serious resumption of East-West detente. This is a battle composed of consistency and far-sightedness and which will aid the cause of detente and peace.

/9274
CSO: 5200/2648

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

U.S.-WESTERN RESPONSES TO GORBACHEV'S PROPOSAL WEIGHED

Budapest NEPSZABADSAG in Hungarian 3 Feb 86 p 3

[Editorial by Peter Sereny: "Disarming Proposal"]

[Excerpt] Thus there is plenty to study, analyze and evaluate in Gorbachev's proposals. But in the West this work is not easy already because the answer to Gorbachev's proposals, as a sort of litmus test, will compel the United States and its allies to show their true color, in two essential respects. And the two are inseparable. First, do the United States and NATO really desire nuclear disarmament? Secondly, if they do, is the United States willing to renounce "space defense" which would thus become superfluous?

Difficult Answer

Let us begin with the first question. Anyone serious about even limiting nuclear weapons will obviously begin by curbing development, which in itself will be beneficial for the negotiation process. This is why the Soviet Union has proposed a moratorium on detonating nuclear weapons and has undertaken on its part--also as proof of its good intent--to suspend experimentation. But, if the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE is to be believed, the official standpoint in the United States is that "the door should be left open" to testing possible "better" nuclear weapons that might emerge, and that it will do no harm to check occasionally the operation even of the existing ones, based on "random sampling." (Incidentally, the newspaper also mentions the need to work out experimentally the nuclear explosion that will power the "star-wars" laser weapon.) Thus the question now is whether there will be a policy decision modifying this concept that is based on military and technological considerations.

This, however, is merely one side of the coin. NATO's entire strategy is based on the principle of nuclear deterrence. Which in plain language means that the response to a hypothetical "Soviet attack" with conventional weapons would automatically be a nuclear strike. Therefore, in the words of an American government official quoted in THE NEW YORK TIMES, Gorbachev's nuclear disarmament proposal "compels us to make a difficult choice, one that we have been reluctant to make up to now." It is an irony of fate that the Soviet initiative takes Ronald Reagan at his word, so to speak. In a statement before the summit, he promised to make an effort to eliminate nuclear missiles before deploying "space defense."

Acceptance by the West of nuclear disarmament, then, is one of the salient points of the answer that is being prepared. The other is space weapons. On the one hand, nuclear disarmament would make them obsolete. But on the other hand, the deployment of space weapons would automatically make utopistic the prospects of limiting nuclear weapons on earth. The momentary situation is that, within days of receiving the Gorbachev proposals, the American President --mentioning, as an old conditioned reflex, a trump card in the negotiations-- publicly confirmed his adherence to his "space defense" concepts. It would be good to hope that this has not been the last word in this matter.

As expressed in the recent statement that our foreign minister issued jointly with his Polish colleague, we deem it desirable that all the parties concerned, and the United States first of all, carefully weigh the Soviet proposals and respond to them constructively, in the spirit of the principles and objectives laid down in the joint communique approved at the Geneva summit. This would produce a favorable change in the international situation, permit a return to detente and to mutually advantageous and broad cooperation, and strengthen international security.

We do not think that this is in the interest of one side alone.

1014
CSO: 5200/3024

USSR NOTES U.S. RESOLUTION CALLING FOR U.S. ADHERENCE TO SALT II

LD071959 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 7 Mar 86

[From the "International Diary" program with Vladimir Pashko]

[Text] A draft resolution has been presented to the U.S. Congress, which calls upon the President to observe the tenets of the treaty on the limitation of strategic armaments, signed in 1979 by the Soviet Union, SALT II.

I will remind you that this was not actually ratified by the Americans, although, in 1982, the United States stated that it would not undertake actions contradictory to the treaty.

Recently in the United States however, the attacks on this document of exclusive importance have intensified, and this has aroused the justified concern of sober-minded Americans. In the opinion of the four legislators who presented the draft resolution, the SALT II treaty made it possible to strengthen strategic parity between the Soviet Union and the United States, and the preservation of this partiy accords with the interests of the national security of the United States. In addition to this, Senator bumpers also stated that the United States ought to strive for a new agreement that could reduce the number of nuclear armaments on both sides.

It is not difficult to see the relation of these words with the opinion of the Soviet Union. After all, it is precisely we who are advocating the equality of parities [as heard] and for a lower level.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1286

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

TASS ON U.S. SUBMARINE MISSILES TESTS--Washington, 22 Feb (TASS)--An intercontinental ballistic missile has been test-fired from America's new submarine Alaska off the coast of Florida. According to the ASSOCIATED PRESS, the aim of the test was to demonstrate combat training of the crew. The Alaska is the seventh Trident missile-carrying submarine in the U.S. Navy. Each underwater vessel of this class carries 24 intercontinental ballistic missiles each armed with eight nuclear warheads capable of hitting targets 4,600 miles away. Special attention is given to the construction of advanced missile-armed submarines within the framework of the Washington administration's current "rearmament" programme. Funds for building the 13th Trident nuclear submarine have already been requested in the current financial year, while the first underwater vessel with newest Trident-2 missiles will enter into service by 1989. Simultaneously, the Pentagon is rapidly modernizing 12 Poseidon submarines, arming them with Trident-1 missiles. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0923 GMT 22 Feb 86] /8309

TASS ON MX TRIAL LAUNCH--San Francisco, 9 Mar (TASS)--The eleventh trial launching of an intercontinental ballistic missile "MX" has been made from the Vandenberg Air Base, California. The testing, as a spokesman for the U.S. Air Force said, has been a success. The launching was made in conditions most close to combat ones from a hardened silo of an intercontinental ballistic missile "Minuteman." The missile was fitted out with nine uncharged MI-21 [as received] warheads. The creation and deployment of first-strike MX missiles is the cornerstone of the massive program for the so-called "rearmament of America" declared by President Reagan. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0658 GMT 9 Mar 86] /8309

CSO: 5200/1286

MOSCOW: HEILBRON EXPLOSION HIGHLIGHTS DANGERS OF U.S. WEAPONS

LD140010 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 13 Feb 86

[From the "International Diary" Program presented by Vladimir Pasko]

[Excerpts] The West German magazine STERN has published an article about the situation at the U.S. Pershing-2 nuclear missile base near Heilbron. Quoting a former U.S. soldier who served on that base, the magazine reports that the Pershing-2 missiles located at Heilbron are not a defense for the FRG but a very great danger.

This is not the first time that the FRG mass information media have written that the Pershing-2 missiles carry a threat for the population of the country. I shall ask my colleague Viktor Levin to speak in greater detail about this:

[Levin] Judging from the first reports from the FRG after the publication of the STERN magazine, many citizens were in a state of near shock. The very word "Heilbron" is becoming a synonym for deadly danger. Just over a year ago, in January 1985, one of the engines of a Pershing-2 missile exploded at Heilbron. According to official data, the explosion occurred as a result of the engine's catching fire during ground tests.

Each time the U.S. command has given assurances that it was just a chance occurrence of such rarity that the possibility of a repeat was allegedly virtually nil. But the West Germans quite reasonably asked: Have there not been too many of these chance occurrences, for if chance occurrences are repeated they become a natural likelihood. The challenger tragedy showed that the pompous boasting about the 100 percent reliability of U.S. equipment is not in accord with reality.

If in such a sphere as space research, on which attention is riveted, we are faced with flagrant carelessness and negligence of safety rules, what can be said about the serial production of missiles. The Pershing-2 missiles are a lurking lethal danger even today. This is the conclusion drawn by the citizens of the FRG. And this conclusion resounds increasingly loudly for there is a realistic path for the total elimination of the threat. This is the path set out in the USSR's proposals on the elimination of the medium-range missiles of the USSR and the United States in the European zone. Such a solution would be in accord with the basic vital interests of the citizens not only of the FRG but also of the whole continent.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1284

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS ANALYST NOTES 'MOMENT OF TRUTH' FOR WEST EUROPE

LD041621 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 4 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow, March 4 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes: A call has been reiterated with full vigor at the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for delivering the world from nuclear weapons.

The USSR suggests completely ridding the European region of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles as a first step which can be taken without delay.

Its proposals on this issue are marked by a spirit of constructiveness.

The Soviet Union met the wishes of the leadership of NATO countries halfway, by expressing readiness not to link the resolution of the problem of medium-range missiles in the European zone with the issues of strategic arms and the non-militarization of outer space.

The corresponding nuclear armaments of Britain and France, even though they are an inalienable component of the European balance of nuclear forces, will not be taken into account.

These are serious moves on the part of the USSR, aimed at facilitating the attainment of a mutual accord.

The sole contribution that would be made by the above West European countries to launching the process of freeing Europe from nuclear weapons would be their pleadging not to raise the number of their corresponding nuclear arms.

All details related to this issue could be the subject of a direct exchange of opinions directly with Britain and France.

The USSR specified also the following important matter: If the American medium-range missiles in Europe are eleminated completely, there will be no longer any need for keeping the Soviet increased-range operational-tactical missiles where they are currently stationed as a reply to the American missile deployments.

So there has come a moment of truth for Western Europe, a time which offers a serious test of political responsibility and an opportunity to demonstrate real intentions.

But even today one is surprised and made wary by the conduct of some representatives of the leadership of West European countries, who have clearly lost their "enthusiasm" and are now resorting to all manner of reservations and excuses.

This attests to the fact that some people in Western Europe are not at all going to think in terms of nuclear disarmament, let alone make a practical contribution to this process.

Moreover, in NATO countries forces openly opposed to the destruction of nuclear weapons have stepped up their activity. West German Defense Minister Manfred Woerner said, for instance, that "no strategy without nuclear weapons is possible on either the global scale or the European scale.

The mountains of arms, which have made the continent into a powder keg, are not enough for such figures. They are urging close West European involvement in the U.S. "star wars" program and also pushing the so-called "European defense initiative" in addition to the American SDI.

Thus a new, even more dangerous spiral of the arms race, a transition to strategic chaos is being programmed.

It is high time these figures fundamentally revised their outdated doctrines based on nuclear weapons, abandoned the futile dreams of achieving military superiority, and realized that the possibilities and nature of modern weapons are such as make the policy of confrontation devoid of any sense.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1284

TASS: ANTIWAR LEADERS SUE NETHERLANDS ON MISSILE PLANS

LD121800 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 12 Mar 86

[Text] Moscow March 12 TASS -- TASS commentator Lev Aksyonov writes: The hearing on the lawsuit brought against the Netherlands' state by 19,548 participants in the anti-war movement started in The Hague. They demand a legislative ban on the deployment in the Netherlands of 48 U.S. cruise missiles that are to be installed there before the end of 1988.

The question of the implementation of NATO's so-called "dual decision" adopted in December 1979 affects not the Netherlands alone. Inundating the territory of countries of the old world with its new nuclear missiles, the Pentagon has not enhanced the security of states of the region at all. Millions of citizens of Britain, FRG, Belgium, Italy, neighbouring countries arrive at the conclusion that the appearance of "Pershing" missiles, "nuclear death", in their countries inevitably turns them into hostages of Washington's nuclear policy.

Political parties, statesmen, scientists, trade union activists, clergymen, medics -- such is far from complete list of the forces participating in a powerful anti-war movement of Western Europe.

Social Democrats of the FRG demand that U.S. missiles be removed. In a statement circulated in Bonn, the presidium of the SDPG urged the FRG Government to declare immediately against the further deployment of those weapons in the country. British Labourites also hold a negative stand in the question of missile deployment. Labourites' leader Neil Kinnock stresses that a Labour government will set as one of its priority aims that of achieving withdrawal of U.S. missiles from the British Isles within a short period of time. He said the Labourites will demand that the USA remove these missiles in the same way as they were brought into Britain, and promptly.

Chairman of the Communist Party of Belgium Louis Van Geyt made a call to the Belgium Government to declare for an early achievement of an agreement on an end to the deployment and on subsequent removal of medium-range nuclear weapons. This would be the best answer of the government to the aspirations of broad circles of the peaceful Belgian public, he stressed.

Olof Palme, Sweden's prime minister, deputy president of the Socialist International, who died a tragic death, had devoted his entire life to the struggle for ridding Europe of armaments.

The Netherlands, which is not a large country, plays a remarkable role in the mass anti-war movement. Citizens of that country which has long-standing traditions of the struggle for peace have no wish to sacrifice their motherland to Washington's claims to "world supremacy". Suffice it to recall the unprecedented scope of the campaign against neutron weapons in the late seventies. As many as four million Dutch have signed the petition of protest against the implementation of NATO's nuclear missile plans.

Reflecting their opinion, leaders of anti-war organizations, who made the initiative for instituting the lawsuit, intend to compel the authorities to heed the voice of the masses. Precisely such developments would suit genuine interests of the security of the Netherlands, of entire Europe.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1284

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

THATCHER REJECTS USSR PROPOSAL ON UK ARMS FREEZE

LD102131 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 2105 GMT 10 Mar 86

[By Tom McMullan, PA political staff]

[Text] Mrs Thatcher is understood to have told the Soviet Union that Russian proposals for a freeze on the present level of Britain's nuclear capability are not acceptable as a condition for negotiations to remove intermediate-range nuclear weapons from Europe. Her reply to Soviet leader Mr Gorbachev's arms control proposals was delivered in Moscow tonight by the British ambassador, Sir Bryan Carledge.

According to diplomatic sources, Mrs Thatcher described as "unacceptable" the Soviet conditions on Britain's minimum strategic force. The implication of the Soviet offer was that Britain would not go ahead with the deployment of the Trident missile system.

In his proposals, outlined some months ago, Mr Gorbachev called for the removal of nuclear weapons from the earth by the end of the century.

The prime minister, in her reply, is said to have emphasised that the goal of a nuclear-free world was necessarily long-term. For the foreseeable future, nuclear weapons as a deterrent would continue to make an essential contribution to peace and stability, she is reported as saying.

The reply is said to have suggested that an effort should be made to concentrate on achieving realistic, balanced and verifiable arms control measures across the board, on the basis of detailed proposals already on the table.

Mrs Thatcher is also said to have stressed a need to correct the imbalance in conventional forces, and to widen East-West discussions to include regional, bilateral and human rights issues.

The reply, which was handed to a Soviet deputy foreign minister, was drafted after intensive consultations with the United States and other allies. The ambassador had hoped to hand the reply to Foreign Minister Mr Eduard Shevardnadze, but it was said in Moscow that he might not be available for some time.

Mr Shevardnadze is due to visit London this year, possibly in May, when the points at issue will be followed up.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1284

FABER'S IKV, LABOR PARTY, KKN DIFFER ON CRUISE STRATEGY

Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 22 Feb 86 p 3

[Article by our staff writer Hubert Smeets: "Faber (IKV) Wants To Get Out Of Cruise Missiles No Committee"]

[Text] The Hague, 22 Feb--As regards preventing the 48 cruise missiles from being deployed at Woensdrecht, the PVDA's campaign strategy is leading nowhere. The polarization on the cruise missiles that this maintains permits the CDA without any problem to block any political discussion at all with the opposition. Thus Mient Jan Faber, general secretary of the Interchurch Peace Council (IKV), who had already given a stern warning to his own PVDA, sees no good coming of the Social Democrats' political course any more.

If the PVDA does not want to throw awayits chance to join the government--which is the only possibility left to thwart the deployment--then Faber says it should show itself ready to make far-reaching concessions on the question of non-nuclear, conventional arms. This of course, Faber says, is all from the prospective that the cruise missiles must not be allowed to come. "Many in the United States feel that Europe's conventional inferiority is much more important than the cruise missiles. People like Senator Nunn have always felt that the European allies--namely Helmut Schmidt--forced the cruise missiles on the United States. Therefore I would be inclined to say: if it is true that the Netherlands contribution to the conventional defense is inadequate, then shouldn't you say that you are prepared to catch up on that inferiority, but that at the same time you are not going to do that other, the cruise missile deployment?"

It is beginning to look like a final scenario Faber is offering the PVDA. "The PVDA too wants a proper, integrated defense of Europe. NATO is no longer an issue inside the party. But if you want to stay in NATO, that demands a certain degree of loyalty. You can't get into the show without paying for the ticket. Conventional arms are a question you can talk to the CDA about."

Senseless Footnotes

He does not give his own suggestion much chance of success though. "This discussion should have been carried out over the past several years. I am afraid it is now too late, because everything you do is immediately interpreted as treason. The question has narrowed down to just cruise missiles, become simplistic." However, he does not see any other way for the PVDA either. A footnote cabinet, a repetition of the Van Agt/Den Uyl cabinet, seems not just unthinkable to him but also senseless. "That cabinet, with a PVDA'er at Foreign Affairs and Van Mierlo at Defense, could have solved it. But that footnote led to a situation where nothing is decided in our own country, so to speak, but where everything is decided from outside, by NATO," Faber says. It is, he says, a vain hope on the PVDA's part that in the 21 May elections it will be able to deprive the present coalition of its majority in Parliament and so thwart the deployment. "The question that strategy poses is a tough one: does it work in favor of the cruise missiles, or not? I am still not so sure about that."

"It is not," Faber argues, "just a question of the power of numbers. If, like the PVDA, you are out to win the center, you also have to be willing to keep open your communication with the center. The opposition should challenge the governing parties to a debate, should be creative, has to creep up on power to convince it to move over to it, the opposition. The government has nailed itself down, but in its position of power it can do that. If the PVDA wants to wrench the CDA loose, it will have to dare to take chances. Otherwise, the alternative is that they will simply be deployed. I have always thought it very peculiar that sometimes the PVDA says: just deploy them,but keep us clean. Surely your promise to the voters is not just what you stand for, but also that you are ready to take risks? Everybody knows that the whole world does not depend on the cruise missiles alone. If they are not deployed, our security will not suddenly be at risk; and if they are deployed, it will not mean the immediate end of our country."

Symbols

"The crazy thing is," the IKV secretary goes on, "that when we are talking about social security, then everybody--however much they disagree--agrees on the need to seek a modus vivendi. In such cases people seek contact, want to behave as responsible politicians. The cruise missiles are the only subject where it is not possible to have credible politics."

The intermediate-range missiles have nothing to do with the future. Faber: "They symbolize the past, only relate to party credibility. There is a striking discrepancy between the PVDA's view on the cruise missiles and the chapter on nuclear weapons in its election program. (Faber had already criticized that paragraph in autumn 1985 because, he said, it represented a step backward compared to 4 years ago and compared to the IKV's motto: "Help rid the world of nuclear weapons, starting with the Netherlands.") 4 years ago the PVDA put much more emphasis on a separate mission for the Netherlands, now its position is based on the idea of 'shared security.' But the cruise missiles are the overarching element."

Looking back, Faber is forced to conclude that last autumn's people's petition, which was so successful quantitatively, "symbolized that the discussion was closed." "We hoped with the people's petition to be able to show that large groups from the political center had signed, that we had penetrated into the camp of the governing parties. That turned out to be just a handful of people, far fewer even than we could reasonably have expected, even in church circles. We achieved a fantastic result, but it was a tragic event. The people's petition demonstrated how polarized society is. The points on which people agree turned out to have been reduced to zero. And after all, you do not demonstrate for the sake of demonstrating, for the sake of showing that the opposition is still united."

Process of Liberation

Did the peace movement not also make a contribution to the now so much regretted, unbridgeable gulf between the opposition and the political center? "Members of the Second Chamber often tell me that: It is your fault, and I mean you personally, that the question has become such a narrow one. But when the IKV broadens the problem, it is immediately seen as a traitor. Certainly that is so in the Cruise Missiles No Committee (KKN). We have been ground up in there. The PVDA (one of the most important partners in the KKN) has of course tried to get as many parts of the population behind it as it could. That process has led to politics getting a larger and larger grip on the peace movement. I have resisted that, but in part I actually created that process," Faber admits. "The KKN has become a kind of institute with internal competition: whose line dominates here?" Thus he no longer sees any role for the IKV in the KKN. "The PVDA wants to keep it under its wing. We want to escape from that and take a position of our own again. So that we can be creative again, can contribute our small ideas. Otherwise the IKV's opponents will turn out to be right after all, namely that we have become an extension of the political parties. For us that is a little bit of a process of liberation. And in all the IKV cells you hear: a few years ago we still had interesting discussions, now we are always demonstrating, they say. You feel the confusion in the movement itself. That is why this spring we are holding a regional tour to visit our cells. We want to do much more about creating contacts between East and West. Because a new atmosphere of detente is growing strong."

This afternoon the IKV will still take part in the KKN congress in de Doelen in Rotterdam, a meeting at which the various members of the Committee can unfold their very differing strategies. It may well be the last time that the KKN meets with the IKV as a member. Faber: "This meeting is the last one for us. After that there are no more political missions for the Committee. It may be that after the elections we will get together again, but not under the pressure to keep the KKN alive, no matter how. It could very well turn out that we will have to close the thing down then, for the time being."

12593
5200/2638

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

AUSTRALIAN OFFICIAL JOINS INQUIRY INTO GULF WAR CHEMICAL USE

BK280943 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 28 Feb 86

[Text] Australia has sent an expert to take part in the United Nations investigation into reports that chemical weapons are being used in the Iran-Iraq war. He is Dr Peter Dunn of the Defense Department's Materials Research Laboratories in Melbourne. Dr Dunn is in charge of the division responsible for research into protection against chemical attack.

A five-man United Nations team has arrived in Tehran to investigate Iran's claims that Iraq has been using chemical weapons against Iranian troops. Iran said chemical weapons had been used on its troops who crossed into southern Iraq earlier this month, but Iraq denied the claims.

The decision to send Dr Dunn to join the United Nations team was announced by the minister for foreign affairs, Mr Hayden. Mr Hayden said that the government was appalled by reports that chemical weapons may again have been used in the Gulf war.

/9599
CSO: 5200/4315

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR SCORES U.S. NUCLEAR TESTS FOR STAR WARS

PM250939 Moscow TRUD in Russian 20 Feb 86 p 3

[Article by Colonel O. Lukyanov under the rubric "Notes of a Military Observer": "Laser for 'Star Wars'"]

[Text] The world public is outraged at the fact that in late 1985 another underground nuclear explosion under the code name "Goldstone" was carried out at the U.S. test site in Nevada. The United States carried out a nuclear test at a time when the Soviet Union, full of concern for reducing international tension and preserving peace on earth, has appealed to Washington more than once to end all nuclear explosions.

Why is Washington defying the world community so brazenly?

The U.S. Administration, under the influence of right-wing forces and the Pentagon, is obviously still spellbound by illusory plans of achieving military, and in particular nuclear, superiority over the Soviet Union. It was to this end that the Pentagon carried out 16 nuclear tests in quick succession last year, thus actually testing about a dozen new types of nuclear munitions and "third generation" nuclear devices. The U.S. press has admitted that the latest nuclear explosions served the aim of completing as soon as possible trials of a nuclear-excited x-ray laser which--according to U.S. "strategic strategists--is to become the main component of the notorious "strategic defense initiative" [SDI]. This program, known as "star wars" in international parlance, was announced by R. Reagan back in March of 1983, and was elevated by presidential directive No 119 to the rank of the paramount task of U.S. state policy through the end of the current century as from 6 January 1984.

The trials of the nuclear-excited x-ray laser are based on the hypothesis that the energy realised during explosions of nuclear charges specially deployed in space will be transformed in the lasers (also located in space) into powerful x-rays. According to the authors of SDI, these x-rays, concentrated and trained on ICBMs in flight will put out of action or destroy most of them within the first 2-5 minutes after launching at altitudes up to 500 km. Consequently, the x-ray laser is based on a deliberate plan to deploy nuclear weapons in space.

Additionally, it is planned to use beam weapons and electromagnetic guns, also located on space stations or platforms, to knock out missiles which have stayed intact. What kind of weapons are these?

Beam weapons (small-scale particle accelerators) are based on the principle of knocking out objects in space by means of high-energy particle beams (neutrons and electrons). According to the Americans, a high-velocity particle beam focused on an object in space is capable of putting it out of action by "eating through" the outer shell and the "inside" of a warhead.

An electromagnetic gun is a device in which an electromagnetic field is used to impart high speeds (several tens of kilometers per second) to special projectiles (bullets) to be used, by means of a guidance system, to intercept missiles or warheads and to physically destroy them. United States' scientists working on this device are hoping to ensure its rapid firing rate.

And finally, the remaining enemy ICBMs and warheads that have separated and escaped destruction are, according to the U.S. "star wars" program to be destroyed in flight by small-scale self-homing missiles launched from satellites and by long-range and short-range land-based antimissile missiles.

At present, Washington has actually embarked on the development [razrabotka] of individual components of this system or, in other words, on the implementation of plans for the militarization of space. In our view, this is above all where the answer has to be sought to the question why the U.S. Administration is refusing to follow the Soviet example and is continuing nuclear explosions.

In continuing tests and elaborating "star wars" programs, the United States is still pursuing the unrealizable dream of achieving military superiority. But that is a futile and dangerous policy. It is futile because our country's material and intellectual potential enables it to create any weapons if forced to do so. And it is dangerous because it leads to the extension of the arms race to space and the creation of a situation where all control over the development of events becomes impossible.

Washington has again been given time to seriously consider the question of joining the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions. As a first effective step toward curbing the nuclear arms race, tests must be stopped. Reason and millions of people on our planet demand this.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1283

USSR: U.S. 'SHORT-SIGHTED, EGOISTIC' ON MORATORIUM

LD230337 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 22 Feb 86

[Text] The moratorium that the Soviet Union set on all nuclear explosions on 6 August last year was later extended by another 3 months. When the Soviet Union was announcing the moratorium it said the moratorium could be prolonged if the United States followed the example. In his message to the Geneva disarmament conference, Mikhail Gorbachev noted that it depends primarily on the United States whether the moratorium will remain in force and whether it will become bilateral and in the end multilateral. There was more than enough time from 6 August to 1 January for Washington to weigh the importance and constructive character of the Soviet initiative and to support it. But the influential figures in Washington that would like the nuclear arms race to continue managed to block a stop to U.S. nuclear tests. What's more, at a time when silence enveloped the Soviet proving ranges, underground nuclear blasts one after another were rocking the state of Nevada. Nevertheless, the Soviet leaders decided not to resume nuclear tests on 1 January but to give Washington another 3 months to think over and adopt the crucial decisions that the international public and, as far as we can see, the American public, too, have been expecting Washington to take.

In the first stage, soon after the Soviet Union began to act on the moratorium, a whole system of arguments was put in action to compromise the Soviet initiative. This was immediately branded as propaganda, but it turned out quickly that the propaganda talk had not been working. The Soviet Union suspended a program of testing of no small significance for maintaining strategic balance in the present-day world. To suspend tests means to suspend the checking of the nuclear warheads available.

For a purely propaganda effect this would have been too high a price. The Soviet Union took those no easy steps in order to move towards a stop to the nuclear arms race. Anyone can see this race can be stopped only by a joint Soviet-American effort. Washington's refusal to halt nuclear tests therefore reflects a glaring contradiction between a stated wish to scrap nuclear weapons and real actions.

The second argument, so to speak, against the moratorium, was the claim that the termination of nuclear tests was an action so insignificant that it hardly deserved a serious thought. But that argument too was shortlived. No system can be developed or improved without testing it. If the simple move proposed by the Soviet Union gets support first from the United States and then by other nuclear powers it can prove the starting point for, and the effective lever, to writing and end to the nuclear arms race.

What can be said to this logic? Nothing. So Washington has nothing to say on this score. Unlike the first few months of the moratorium when officials in Washington were laying themselves out to figure out arguments against a stop to nuclear explosions, now they are simply keeping silent. But there is no time to lose. If the United States does not join the moratorium the Soviet Union will have to resume its program of nuclear testing so as not to give the United States any unilateral advantages. As a result of its short-sighted and egoistic position Washington will assume a grave responsibility to the whole world for a unique chance lost.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1283

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: SIX NATIONS CALL FOR TOTAL NUCLEAR TEST BAN

Coincides With USSR Stance

LD112159 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1724 GMT 11 Mar 86

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Sergey Pravdin]

[Text] News agencies are summarizing a new statement by the leaders of six countries--Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania, and Sweden -- which includes an appeal to the United States and the USSR to carry out no nuclear tests before the next Soviet-American summit meeting, planned for this year. As REUTER news agency notes, the text of the statement by the authors of the well-known Delhi Declaration was agreed and adopted during the life of the late Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, who was villainously murdered at the end of last month. To comment on this act by eminent statesmen and politicians of six states of Europe, Latin America, Asia, and Africa, I shall ask my colleague, Igor Surguchev:

Their appeal is addressed to both Moscow and Washington, but in essence it is an urgent appeal to the U.S. Administration to join, before it is too late, the unilateral Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which runs out in 20 days. The world clearly understands the exceptional importance and value of our country's initiative in introducing the moratorium, which opens up realistic prospects for progress toward curbing the nuclear arms race and ultimately ridding mankind of the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe. It is for just this reason that public and political circles of various countries are demanding ever more insistently that the White House should not miss a favorable moment. but should follow the Soviet Union's example.

And now, once again, six states on four continents are raising their voices on behalf of hundreds of millions of people in support of the idea of stopping nuclear tests. There is no doubt that their present concrete proposal is constructive in character and can be put into practice if the United States agrees to halt nuclear explosions. So it is not the USSR that is holding things up.

However, as Soviet leaders have often stressed, our country cannot go on forever extending its unilateral moratorium. The Reagan administration must at last understand that the question of halting nuclear tests affects not only the United States and the Soviet Union; it concerns the vital interests of all peoples, of all mankind.

And the authors of the Delhi Declaration, in their appeal, are once again reminding the White House of this.

In conclusion, I would like to note that the realization of the proposal put forward by them would agree entirely both with the Soviet-American accords in Geneva and with our country's approach to the holding of the next meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States. This approach is that the meeting must be marked by real, tangible results in the field of curbing the arms race and disarmament. A bilateral moratorium on nuclear tests would in itself be a significant achievement and a good prerequisite for the conclusion of an international agreement on the total prohibition of such tests.

U.S. Rejects Appeal

LD121134 Moscow TASS in English 1046 GMT 12 Mar 86

[Text] Washington March 12 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Shvets reports:

The U.S. Administration has again turned down the possibility of a moratorium on nuclear testing and reiterated its intention to continue nuclear explosions for military purposes. Asked by TASS to comment on the proposal of six nonaligned countries to this effect, a spokesman for the Department of State said that the U.S. position of principle on nuclear testing remained unchanged and that nuclear weapons would remain the key element of the policy of "deterrence" in the foreseeable future. Nuclear testing will therefore continue to be essential, he said.

The leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden and Tanzania sent letters to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, suggesting that the USSR and the USA refrain from nuclear tests till the next Soviet-American summit and offered assistance in organizing reliable verification of compliance with such a moratorium. The reply of the U.S. Administration, which flatly rejected that major international initiative without going to the trouble of seriously examining it, shows that Washington is opposed in principle to the elimination of nuclear weapons. The U.S. stand also illustrates the hyprocrisy of the White House, which calls for ridding mankind of the threat of nuclear war while carrying on strenuous preparations for such a war.

To justify its destructive course, the administration has been holding forth at length on the need for effective verification of compliance with a moratorium so that it would be possible to introduce it. Saying that verification was unreliable, the USA refused to follow the example of the Soviet Union, which introduced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union has stated on more than one occasion that it is prepared to work out dependable verification measures if an agreement on the moratorium is achieved. To contribute towards accord between the USSR and the USA in that area, the leaders of the six nonaligned countries offered in their letters their assistance in organizing dependable verification that would guarantee strict compliance with a moratorium on nuclear testing.

Such control would also include on-site inspections, held by the USA to be the main problem in the matter of arms control. The categorical rejection of that initiative in addition to others testifies to the outright hypocrisy of the White House.

The cause of this obstructionist line is clear: The USA views nuclear testing as an essential basic element of the modernization of its strategic forces, of the development of new weapons of mass destruction and the establishment of a partially space-based ABM system under its "star wars" program.

U.S. Public Supports Ban

PM121231 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Mar 86 First Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent V. Gan: "For an End to Nuclear Explosions; American Public Demands"]

[Text] Washington, 11 Mar -- A group of U.S. legislators has held a press conference on Capitol Hill in support of the appeal to the USSR and the United States to refrain from nuclear tests issued by the leaders of Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Sweden, and Tanzania. In this statements, Senators Harkin and Simon and Representatives Bedell, Downey, and Leach pointed out that a mutual nuclear moratorium would be an important step in strengthening confidence between the two countries and would contribute to talks on concluding a treaty on the complete and comprehensive prohibition of nuclear explosions.

In Senator Harkin's opinion, the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva last November provided hope for peace by stating that nuclear war must never be unleashed and can have no winners. However, words alone cannot halt the nuclear arms race, just as promises cannot prevent nuclear war. Therefore I support the appeal to introduce a moratorium until the next Soviet-U.S. summit talks, the senator declared.

The press conference participants emphasized the extreme urgency of taking concrete steps to curb the arms race in the interests of all mankind. As long as nuclear arms exist, there cannot be security in the world -- these words from the appeal by the six countries' leaders were the leitmotiv of the senators' and congressmen's statements.

It may be said without exaggeration that the legislators' opinion is supported by millions of Americans, who have mounted a national campaign to force the Reagan administration to subscribe to the USSR's unilateral moratorium. The Committee of American Friends in the Service of Society -- a Quaker organization -- is currently collecting signatures for a statement which reads, in part: "We believe that the Soviet moratorium on nuclear tests is an important step to achieving the goal of ending the nuclear arms race. We call on President Reagan to make an appropriate reply to it by immediately stopping all U.S. nuclear tests." This statement was approved at a joint conference of 25 U.S. antiwar organizations, which plan to send it to the White House.

In other words, people are demanding that official Washington confirm in practical deeds its eloquent talk about wanting peace and the elimination of nuclear arms. The administration, however, prefers to ignore these calls. THE WASHINGTON POST reports today that a new series of underground nuclear tests is expected to begin soon at the test range in Nevada.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1283

SOVIET SEISMOLOGIST ASSURES OF TEST MONITORING ABILITY

LD110948 Moscow TASS in English 0859 GMT 11 Mar 86

[Text] Leningrad March 11 TASS -- "The unilateral moratorium announced by the Soviet Government on nuclear weapon testing is an act of good will which is not only of a high humane value but is also of great importance to contemporary science," stated Vladimir Kochetov, a prominent Soviet seismologist. "Each underground explosion at proving grounds," the scientist explained his thought, "as it 'slurs over' the overall picture of the natural seismic background of the plant and for some time prevents us from watching the state of the earth's interior and from prognosticating possible foci of earthquakes."

Vladimir Kochetov is heading one of the world's oldest seismic stations, the Pulkovo, near Leningrad. This is an international centre for recording seismic activity in the Artic and in Antarctica. Data on all tectonic manifestations in the polar regions of the earth are generalised at the centre every year.

"Up-to-date apparatus makes it possible to record and with great accuracy to determine the epicentres of the slightest earth tremors even in regions which are so far from us", the seismologist emphasized. "The abcurdity of assertions that undergroud nuclear tests are allegedly impossible to verify by national technical means is particularly obvious to us specialists.

The systems of international procedures for the observance of the moratorium, which are proposed in Mikhail Gorbachev's statement aimed at reducing and eliminating nuclear arsenals by the year 2000, may become all the more effective."

"Mikhail Gorbachev once again emphasized in the Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Congress of the party that all-embracing, strictest verification is perhaps the key element of the disarmament process", the scientist said.

"The moratorium on all nuclear explosions, I am sure, has already had an effect on the readings of seismic-station instruments around the world and has become an eloquent illustration of the practicability of full verificaition of underground experiments with weapons of mass destruction," Vladimir Kochetov said. The Soviet scientist is convinced that the Soviet Government's concrete steps on the way to disarmament are prompted by a high awareness of responsibility for the utilisation of scientific achievements exclusively for peaceful purposes.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1283

USSR NOTES 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEABED ARMS CONTROL TREATY

'Triumph of Common Sense'

LD102256 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1540 GMT 10 Feb 86

[Text] Moscow 10 Feb (TASS) -- Vasiliy Kharkov, TASS observer, writes:

11 February is a date which has become one of the landmarks on the path of mankind leading to limitation of arms race. On this day, 15 years ago, a treaty on banning the siting of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the bed of seas and oceans and underneath it, was opened for signing simultaneously in Moscow, Washington and London. The working-out of this important document in international law was commenced on the initiative of the Soviet Union. More than 2 years were needed before the draft of this treaty was approved by the 25th session of the UN General Assembly. This was an undoubted success for the cause of peace. The treaty corresponded fully to the task of reducing nuclear threat and strengthening international security.

The preamble of the treaty expresses the deep conviction of its participants, that it will provide a possibility to exclude in full the seas' and oceans' bed from the sphere of the nuclear arms race. The countries which signed it also proceeded from the fact that this was an important step on the path to a treaty on general and full disarmament under strict and effective international supervision. They expressed their resolve to continue negotiations toward this aim.

More than 100 states signed the treaty during the past years. This represents a confirmation of its topical nature. The fact that the treaty has come into force is evidence of the triumph of common-sense, it is a confirmation of the fact that given the presence of good will and a striving for the achievement of an accord, other problems connected with nuclear disarmament can also be resolved successfully.

We succeeded to agree to exclude sea and ocean bed from the field of the nuclear arms race 15 years ago. But, as far as other directions are concerned, this race has acquired an even more dangerous character. The world public opinion considers that a path towards relieving mankind from fear of nuclear catastrophe is outlined in the Soviet program for full elimination of nuclear weapons worldwide. The Soviet initiative determines precisely outlined land-marks and proposes specific periods for the achievement of this truly grand goal.

Now the issue of first rate importance is not to allow the arms race to spread into space. To avert militarization of space means to remove the barrier from the path towards deep reductions and later towards full elimination of nuclear armaments. Following the sea and ocean bed, the nuclear threat has to be eliminated forever on our planet as a whole and in space. This is the only sensible way leading to securing a peaceful future for mankind.

U.S. Violation of SALT

PM121437 Moscow SOVETSKAYA Rossiya in Russian 11 Feb 86 first edition p 3

[A. Mozgovoy article: "When There Is Good Will" -- first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Exactly 15 years ago the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof was opening for signing in Moscow, Washington, and London.

Over 70 states are now party to this very important international agreement, which was in its way a prelude to the conclusion of a number of other accords in the arms limitation sphere of the detente era.

The Soviet Union initiated the elaboration of the treaty. The USSR Government's 1 July 1968 memorandum on some urgent measures to end the arms race and achieve disarmament emphasized: "The progress of research and the prospects for the exploration of the seabed and ocean floor make it possible to raise the question of promptly enshrining in an appropriate form a means to ensure the use of the seabed outside current territorial waters solely for peaceful purposes. In this way, the creation of fixed military installations on the seabed would specifically be banned, as would other activity of a military character."

At talks held at the United Nations and the Geneva Disarmament Committee it became clear that the United States and its allies were not ready for the complete banning of military activity on the ocean floor and in its subsoil. That is why the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries, and also the nonaligned countries compromised. The treaty, signed 11 February 1971, bans only the deployment beyond the limits of the 12-mile coastal zone of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and of structures, launching installations, and other facilities designed for storing, testing, or using such weapons.

The unwillingness of the United States and its partners in aggressive alliance call a halt to the process of militarizing the seabed is due to their desire to secure military advantages for themselves in the world's oceans. For instance, the United States is implementing a program to deploy a system of fixed highly sensitive hydrophones and sonars on the Atlantic and Pacific ocean floors. In the opinion of U.S. military expert R. Alridge, this system is of a marked offensive nature and is designed to upset the balance of strategic forces. The deployment of such complexes undoubtedly contradicts the Soviet-U.S. Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties. However, the Pentagon's gamble on gaining maritime superiority only leads to the improvement of the means of waging war at sea.

At the second conference on observing the operation of the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Seabed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof held in 1983 the USSR and the other socialist community countries again urged the full demilitarization of the seabed and the conclusion of new agreements to that end. All peace-loving states adhere to a similar viewpoint. The first Committee of the 40th UN General Assembly session adopted a corresponding draft resolution. It contains an appeal to all countries to refrain from any actions capable of leading to the proliferation of the arms race to the seabed and ocean floor as well as to examine the necessary measures to prevent the militarization of the seabed.

The 1971 treaty confirms that any agreement in the strategic arms limitation sphere is possible if the partners in the talks have the desire and good will for that. It is particularly important to make that point now when the Geneva summit has aroused in the peoples, as M.S. Gorbachev stresses in his replies to L'HUMANITE'S questions, the "hope and belief in the possibility of a return to detente, the ending of the insane arms race, and the development of normal peaceful international cooperation." The Soviet Union's recent disarmament proposals represent a radical and at the same time realistic program for removing the nuclear threat.

/12929
CSO: 5200/1287

SOCIALIST BLOC SOLIDLY DEFENDS PEACE

PM181537 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Feb 86 First Edition p 3

[Article by Candidate of Historical Sciences Colonel A. Sytezhev under the rubric "Through Joint Efforts Toward a Single Goal": "Determination to Defend peace"]

[Excerpt] The sinister U.S. foreign policy course is being impeded to a considerable degree by the unshakable determination of the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries to preserve peace.

The question of war and peace is the chief, fundamental problem of our time. The Soviet Union believes that interstate relations must be based strictly on the principles of peaceful coexistence and on unconditional respect for the interests of all states -- large, medium and small. And the other socialist community countries adhere to the same viewpoint. Socialism, the draft new edition of the CPSU program notes, demonstrates its advantages not by force of weapons but by force of example in all spheres of social life -- by the dynamic development of the economy, science, and culture, the raising of the working people's living standards, and the strengthening of socialist democracy.

Having entered the new 5-Year period of creative labor, the peoples of the fraternal socialist community countries are making every effort to ensure the successful fulfillment of the major tasks facing them and to accelerate their progress. The competition to worthily greet the Marxist-Leninist parties' routine congresses, which will be held in many community countries this year, has developed widely. Playing the leading role in socialist and communist building, the fraternal parties firmly and consistently pursue a concerted peace-loving course in the international arena.

The need for the socialist countries' ever greater rapprochement stems from the very essence of socialism, the draft new edition of the CPSU program points out. Acting in close unity, the socialist countries and other revolutionary, progressive, and democratic forces can alter the dangerous course of events and ensure the assertion of the policy of peace, detente, disarmament, and international cooperation on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

In the postwar years, under the conditions of the arms race unleashed by the imperialists, the socialist countries have had to divert considerable funds to defend socialist gains and to uphold the cause of peace. The establishment of military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States and between the Warsaw Pact Organization and NATO was socialism's historic achievement. It strengthened the positions of the USSR, the socialist countries, and all progressive forces and overturned the calculations of imperialism's aggressive forces for victory in a world nuclear war. The preservation of this equilibrium is an earnest guarantee of ensuring peace and international security. The Soviet state and its allies do not seek to achieve military superiority, but neither will they allow the military-strategic equilibrium which has taken shape in the world arena to be upset.

As long as the imperialist military NATO bloc exists, the draft new edition of the CPSU program states, the party considers it essential to help improve the Warsaw Pact Organization's activity in every possible way as an instrument of collective defense against imperialism's aggressive aspirations and of joint struggle for lasting peace and the broadening of international cooperation.

The conference of the Warsaw Pact States' Political Consultative Committee, held in Sofia, demonstrated the unity of the allied socialist states' views on the fundamental problems of European and world politics discussed there. The significance of the fraternal countries' joint actions in implementing their policy of radically improving international relations, strengthening the allied countries' unity and cohesion, and reliably ensuring their security was emphasized at the conference. The most important results of the Sofia conference were the strengthening of the allied socialist states' unity and cohesion, the improvement of the machinery of their cooperation within the Warsaw Pact framework, and the fraternal countries' unbending determination to continue waging a persistent struggle for our planet's peaceful future.

To protect the earth from a nuclear conflagration and divert the threat from our civilization, the comprehensive Soviet plan for peace and disarmament advanced in the CPSU Central Committee General Secretary's Statement of 15 January this year is aimed at carrying out this historic task. To have by the year 2000 a world free of nuclear, chemical, and all other weapons of mass destruction, to deliver mankind from constant fear for its future, to transfer to peaceful needs the tremendous funds being spent on the arms race -- this is the noble, truly humane aim of these new Soviet initiatives warmly supported by all the socialist community countries. The USSR's constructive peace-loving course was reaffirmed in M.S. Gorbachev's replies to L'HUMANITE'S questions.

The socialist community is the most authoritative force of today, without which not a single question of world politics can be resolved. It is the strong bulwark of peace on earth, the most consistent defender of healthy, peaceful, democratic principles in international relations, and the chief obstacle in the path of imperialist reaction. The CPSU, the draft new edition of the program emphasizes, considers it its international duty, together with the other fraternal parties, to strengthen the unity and increase the might and influence of the socialist community. It is on its strength, on the successes of each country's creative activity, and on the purposeful and concerted nature of their actions that the course of socialism's competition with capitalism and the future of world civilization depend to a huge degree.

/12929
CSO: 5200/1287

RELATED ISSUES

ARMY PAPER ON USSR'S COMMITMENT TO PEACE STRUGGLE

PM251144 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Feb 86 second edition p 3

[A. Leontyev "publicist's notes": "Along the road of exploits"]

[Excerpt] You would think that the routing of Hitlerite Germany -- the shock force of world imperialism -- ought to have taught a great deal to those who aspire to world domination. The war conclusively demonstrated the futility of any attempts to destroy socialism by force of arms. The most important consequence of the great victory was socialism's emergence outside the confines of a single country and the formation of the world socialist system.

However, people in the West clearly have a poor grasp of the lessons of history. Even before the war had ended, people in the bunkers of the Pentagon began to hatch plans for attacking the Soviet Union. The explosions of the atom bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki were aimed at hinting to our country what was in store for it unless it obeyed U.S. diktat. But Soviet people are not easily scared. And although the USSR had still not recovered after the war -- many cities and villages lay in ruins -- we accomplished another exploit: Within a short time we eliminated the U.S. nuclear monopoly and then we secured approximate strategic military parity between the USSR and the United States. This was a gain of world historic significance that was a most serious warning to the potential aggressor.

In the hope of regaining military superiority, Washington unleashed a feverish arms race and the production of more and more new means of mass destruction. U.S. arsenals are now bulging at the seams, so to speak, with a multitude of nuclear bombs and shells, chemical weapons, and other barbaric weapons. The Pentagon generals now feel cramped on earth and are trying to climb into space in an endeavor to pack it with strike space weapons and turn it into their own military bridgehead. They intend to implement the "star wars" program, which poses a threat of the destruction of all mankind.

The reality of that threat was shown by the recent "Challenger" tragedy, THE NEW YORK TIMES admits. "Now even school children can see," the U.S. magazine NATION writes, "that any malfunction like the one that happened to the 'Challenger' at best condemns the SDI (the 'Strategic Defense Initiative' is what the 'star wars' program is called in the United States) to failure and at worst may be the chief cause of national suicide."

It is worth recalling that a few years ago a report appeared in the press that in 18 months alone in the United States there had been 3,703 military alerts notifying that the "enemy" had switched to military operations against the United States. The absolute majority of these alerts were immediately recognized as false alarms, but 152 were "serious enough to make it possible to see in them a chance of potential attack." In other words, every 3 or 4 days the earth was close to disaster. What guarantee is there that the "star wars" computers will be proof against errors, each of which would mean a worldwide disaster? The notorious SDI may mean not a "mental leap into the future," as U.S. Secretary of State Shultz bombastically claims, but a very real U.S. leap into the abyss.

The first country of victorious socialism and our Leninist party, which is approaching its 27th congress, pit against the extremely dangerous U.S. militarist course a specific and realistic program for improving the international situation. We are proposing entering the 21st century without nuclear, chemical, or other weapons of mass destruction. Our approach to this great aim is bolstered by the Soviet Union's extension of its moratorium on any nuclear explosions. We have suggested to the United States that it join in the moratorium. We regard preventing the militarization of space as the fundamental condition for ending the arms race.

Time is passing, but Washington is still delaying its reply to the Soviet proposals. But a great deal is already becoming clear. Delivering his "State of the Union" message in Congress, President R. Reagan again repeated the myth of the "threat from Soviet forces, both non nuclear and strategic" and the "Soviet Union's desire for dominance" and militated for a further unchecked buildup in the arms race. For his part Defense Secretary Weinberger never tires of stating that the United States has no intention of abandoning the "star wars" program and will continue nuclear explosions. Millionaires applaud him.

But, characteristically, not all applaud him. After all, millionaires too want to live... The idea of the need to stop the madmen is persistently getting through to all sensible people. Peace is needed by Americans, Russians, and everyone else. The peoples are tired of living in a state of constant alarm over their security and abject fear of nuclear catastrophe. They see the acceptance of the new Soviet proposals as the real way to prevent a world holocaust.

The militarist fever in the United States and the other NATO countries, and also in Japan, the "undeclared wars" against the peoples of Afghanistan, Nicaragua, Cambodia, and Angola, and the provocations against Libya are direct evidence of the increase in imperialism's aggressiveness, which must be taken into account. The party is making every effort to ensure that the USSR Armed Forces are at a level precluding strategic superiority on the part of imperialism's forces and that the Soviet land's defense capability is comprehensively improved. The present defenders of our motherland, faithful to the traditions of the older generations, are honorably fulfilling their patriotic and international duty. The servicemen of the limited contingent of Soviet forces in Afghanistan are showing themselves to be courageous patriots and internationalists. The whole world knows our servicemen to be like that.

We are optimists. We believe that the obstacles on the road to peace will be swept aside, that reason will prevail, and that the age-old dream of a planet without war will be realized. This will be the greatest exploit of all progressive mankind. An exploit for whose sake our people are living, working, and making a weighty contribution to the struggle for peace.

/12929
CSO: 5200/1287

RELATED ISSUES

SED'S AXEN WRITES IN PRAVDA ON PEACE ISSUES

PM191135 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Feb 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by Hermann Axen, member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee: "The Most Important Task of Today"]

[Text] Berlin, February -- Public life in the GDR is currently dominated by preparations for the 11th SED Congress. Its convocation gave rise to a mass movement characterized by broad nationwide discussion and significant new initiatives from the working people.

At the Central Committee plenums held in June and November last year, Comrade Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee, defined the tasks in preparing for the congress, which is to begin work on 17 April. In close fraternal alliance with the party and country of Lenin and firmly united within the socialist community, we see it as our duty to increase economic efficiency still further in line with the demands of the new stage of the country's sociopolitical development. In view of the aggravated international situation, it is necessary also to adopt every measure to end the arms race on earth and prevent the militarization of space. Our party attaches decisive significance to the policy elaborated at its Central Committee plenum in November 1983 for forming a broad coalition of reason and realism of all forces which want to avert the nuclear hell. In its principled and at the same time flexible foreign policy acts, the SED proceeds on the basis that all states, big and small, and especially European states, must make the greatest possible efforts to resolve the most important task of our time -- that of ensuring peace. Nobody is entitled to remain aloof.

The guiding line in the implementation of a socialist European policy oriented toward peace and cooperation is laid down by the Warsaw Pact states' Sofia statement and the results of the meeting of the top leaders of the fraternal community states held in Prague immediately after the Geneva Summit meeting.

Comrade Erich Honecker described that meeting as encouraging and positive, although its results did not justify all expectations and hopes. True, the top representatives of the USSR and the United States stressed the importance of preventing any war -- nuclear or conventional -- between those two countries, and also stated their commitment to renounce the desire for military superiority. This joint recognition of the need to prevent war, which takes account of the real correlation of forces in the world, gives the peoples and states good opportunities for averting the threat of war and beginning to improve the international situation.

In assessing the international situation, the socialist community states point with particular urgency to the new situation. Throughout the world there is a growing awareness that in a nuclear war there will be neither victors nor vanquished; such a war will certainly jeopardize mankind's continued existence. If we want to survive, then we must all -- as M.S. Gorbachev has repeatedly noted -- learn to live together in peace.

It follows from this, with implacable logic, that all states and political forces must adopt a new approach to questions of war and peace. Either mankind will take its opportunity and act in such a way as to ensure that the possibilities created at the Geneva summit meeting lead to concrete agreements in the spirit of peaceful coexistence; or aggressive imperialist forces will succeed in launching a new spiral of the arms race through the production and siting of offensive weapons in space and the rapid development of new systems of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction. That would dangerously destabilize the international situation and push mankind inevitably toward the abyss.

The bellicose circles of monopoly capital intend, by all appearances, to do everything they can to restrain the further advance of the forces of peace and social progress. In their desire to stop the profound crisis processes and internal erosion of their system, in their desire for profits and world domination, in the crazy intention of taking social revenge for their historical defeats, they consider it morally justified to stake everything, even mankind's very existence.

As has happened more than once in history, the reactionaries and militarists incorrectly interpret the real correlation of forces, overestimate their own potential, especially their technological potential, and believe that they can thereby achieve political and military superiority over socialism. These forces, by siting new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe, sought to sharply increase their might for a first strike against the USSR and the other socialist countries. Once they realized that their plans had been foiled by countermeasures by the USSR, the GDR, and the CSSR, they tried at all costs to prevent the Soviet-American summit in Geneva from taking place or to bring about its failure. But they did not succeed there either.

As a result of the Geneva meeting more favorable opportunities emerged for reviving the process of military and political relaxation of tension. But adventurist, militarist circles in the United States have not given up their intentions. They are sabotaging and undermining the results of the Geneva meeting, continuing to prepare to site offensive weapons in space, and seeking to whip up and destabilize the situation in various conflict regions and to weaken the forces fighting for the peoples' national and social liberation. Evidence of this is provided by the attacks and hostile acts against Libya, Lebanon, the Palestinian liberation movement, Nicaragua, and the peoples of southern Africa. However, world politics is today determined not only by the forces of reaction, and in fact less and less by them. And in the past years imperialism has not succeeded in changing the international correlation of forces in its own favor or reversing the main positive trend in world development. This is due above all to the might and the peace-loving policy of socialism, first and foremost the USSR.

The CPSU, the Soviet government, and Comrade M.S. Gorbachev personally creatively develop the Leninist peace-loving policy, setting an example, with their bold initiatives, of a new approach to questions of peace and war in the light of the new political realities. The 15 January statement by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee paves the way for the struggle to avert the dangers of a world nuclear conflagration and bring about a turn toward a radical improvement in world politics. It is a very broad, comprehensive program aimed at freeing the planet completely and finally from nuclear, chemical, and other weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000.

The implementation of this comprehensive program would mean an end to the fatal arms race. It would be possible to achieve a reduction in the existing military-strategic parity, to a considerably lower level.

This program offers the only reasonable alternative to the insane philosophy of representative so the military-industrial complex who want to "free" mankind from nuclear arms with the help of "star wars" weapons and other dangerous systems of mass destruction.

Convincing new evidence of the Soviet Union's sincere efforts in the sphere of arms limitation and disarmament is provided by a practical step of great significance, namely the USSR's decision to extend for another 3 months the moratorium on all nuclear explosions so as to close really reliably all the channels for the improvement of nuclear weapons.

What a highly significant start to the UN International Year of Peace! Not simply a declaration of peace, but a very broad peace-loving act in international policy.

It is proposed that the United States, before the eyes of the world public, also stop nuclear tests and resolve to take a step as a result of which neither side would lose anything, but the peoples would acquire greater security, since this would close really reliably all the channels for the improvement of nuclear weapons.

All who have an interest in peace approve the package of new Soviet initiatives. The extensive program is not based only on the interests of the Soviet Union and its allies, but takes constructive account of the other side's positions. And above all it expresses the vital interests of all mankind, the desire to live in peace and security.

This is manifested very clearly, for instance, in questions concerning Europe -- the continent on which two devastating world wars raged. Today it is saturated with lethal means of mass destruction. That is why the flexible new Soviet proposals on reducing and ultimately eliminating medium-range missiles are finding such a broad response here in Europe. That is why they are giving political forces the impetus to use Peace Year to rebuild the edifice of relaxation of tension in Europe.

The SED adheres to the view that the implementation of this peace program is a necessary and at the same time realistic task. Through the people's struggle and the joint participation of all peace-loving forces, the dangerous plans and intrigues of the small but powerful groupings of the most aggressive, reactionary, and militaristic circles of international monopoly capital, headed by the United States, could be brought to nothing.

The GDR considerably stepped up its foreign policy acts to strengthen peace during a period of continuing and progressive deterioration in the international situation. Being located on the watershed between socialism and imperialism, between the Warsaw Pact and NATO, after the deployment of the American missiles in Western Europe it stepped up its efforts, within the framework of the community of socialist states, to make an active, constructive contribution to the further continuation and strengthening of political dialogue in the struggle for peace and the prevention of nuclear annihilation.

Comrade Erich Honecker's meetings with leading politicians from France, Italy, Canada, the FRG, Greece, Austria, Japan, Britain, Finland, Sweden, Cyprus, and other countries have increased mutual understanding. The development of bilateral relations on the basis of equality, respect for sovereignty, recognition of borders, and noninterference in internal affairs has strengthened trust and made it apparent that other possibilities are emerging for the struggle to strengthen peace and promote disarmament.

This also applies to relations between the GDR and the FRG. Our country does everything possible to ensure that war never again originates from German soil, and that only peace originates there. The FRG ruling circles have repeatedly come out in the same spirit. The GDR's concrete proposals are aimed at following up these verbal statements with concrete actions. Everything that lessens the danger of confrontation on the watershed between socialism in Europe [as published] is of extremely great significance for the preservation of peace. This end is also served by the meeting between Erich Honecker and FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl in Moscow on 12 March last year, during which it was noted that the inviolability of borders and respect for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all European states in Europe [as published] within their present borders constitute a fundamental condition of peace.

Practical experience confirms that international security and cooperation can only be achieved when the idea of peaceful coexistence prevails in matters of ensuring peace. In this spirit the SED has developed the policy of dialogue and realism with numerous parties and political movements, including socialist and social democratic parties.

Comrade Erich Honecker's meeting with Willi Brandt, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD], and the results of the SED and SPD joint initiative on creating a zone free from chemical weapons in Europe gave valuable impetus to the struggle to prevent nuclear war. These active steps, incorporated in the peace initiative of the GDR and CSSR5 governments, aroused great interest in European countries. Various political forces assess them as a necessary step toward preventing a chemical arms race, lessening the dangers which already exist, and creating a climate of confidence between states.

The 27th CPSU Congress, the 11th SED Congress, and the congresses of the other fraternal parties will outline ways of further strengthening socialism. Their discussions will undoubtedly be centered on questions of broad, accelerated economic intensification on the basis of the latest achievements of science and technology and the considerable improvement of labor productivity as being ultimately the decisive factor for the victory of the socialist system and a necessary prerequisite for ensuring peace.

The GDR will continue to spare no effort, in close alliance with the USSR and the other fraternal countries, to give life to the socialist strategy of peace and to continue to take part in the building of a socialist European policy.

/12929
CSO: 5200/1287

CANADIAN ARMS CONTROL CENTER ATTACKS NORAD RENEWAL REPORT

Toronto THE TORONTO STAR in English 19 Feb 86 p A3

[Article by Joe O'Donnell]

[Text]

OTTAWA — Just a "faction" of the 211 Progressive Conservatives MPs supports a recommendation that the government renew its major air defence agreement with the United States, an independent disarmament group says.

And those MPs backed that decision to help compensate the U.S. for Canada's decision not to participate in Star Wars research, the Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament said yesterday.

The centre's remarks represent the toughest attack yet on a report to Parliament last week by the standing committee on external affairs and national defence.

Betrayed trust

The 21 Tory members backed renewal for five years of the North American Aerospace Defence Command (NORAD) agreement, to be signed in May. The five Liberals on the panel issued a dissenting report as did the four New Democrats.

The centre believes the report represents "a faction that has remained unreconciled to the government's decision last year on participation in SDI (Strategic Defence Initiative, the formal name for Star Wars)," John Lamb, executive director of the centre, told a news conference.

This faction, he said, "was determined to make good to the Americans the trust they felt had been betrayed by that decision."

Opponents of the committee's majority recommendation all want the same thing — re-instatement of a clause dropped from the agreement when it was last renewed in 1981. The clause rules out any participation by NORAD in anti-ballistic missile defence.

They insist that Star Wars, the U.S. government's $26 billion research program into a space-based defence system, would violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty between the superpowers. It limits the testing and deployment of defence systems against long-range missiles.

The Mulroney government announced last summer that it would not participate in Star Wars research, but private sector involvement was not banned.

No participation

The committee "betrayed a view that a sound relationship with the U.S. can only be maintained on the basis of a slavish deference to American preferences," said Lamb, whose group is partly funded by the government.

The centre, which also urges a renewal period of three or four years, rather than the usual five, based its concerns on a lengthy, historical analysis of NORAD prepared by defence policy analyst David Cox.

Cox traces Canada's participation in NORAD to the first signing of the agreement in 1958. He concludes that Canada has been, at times, unwittingly drawn into American "nuclear war-fighting doctrines . . . buried in the language of (nuclear) deterrence."

His report recounts the political problems encountered by the Diefenbaker administration in 1962 when it attempted to evict American nuclear weapons from Canadian soil.

Cox said it is no more possible today than it was in 1962 for Canada "to deny its geography to the strategic defence efforts of the United States."

But, he added, "With more skilful political management, there may be a greater range of choice (for Canada today.)"

Lamb said that the NORAD report "is so deficient as to be quite unreliable as policy advice.

"At the root of the problem, not surprisingly, is a political consideration. This report, we believe, needs to be looked at as the report of a faction of the Conservative party."

At odds

For that reason, he said, the defence committee's report is "different in tone from last year's Senate study on air defence, the interim report of the Special Joint Committee on Canada's International Relations and recent statements by External Affairs Minister Joe Clark on Star Wars.

"All of these expressed considerable concern about SDI and its present implications for Canada." Lamb said.

"The committee, in contrast, virtually dismisses SDI as nothing that Canadians should be concerned about.

But if Star Wars "proceeds to deployment . . . it is difficult to see how NORAD could remain uninvolved."

/9317
CSO: 5220/31

CANADA: COMMONS QUESTIONS RAISED OVER CRUISE TEST CRASH

Toronto THE GLOBE AND MAIL in English 26 Feb 86 pp A1, A2

[Article by Charlotte Montgomery and Andrew Nikiforuk]

[Text]

The federal Government has promised that test flights of the cruise missile will continue over northwestern Canada despite the second consecutive crash yesterday of the controversial missile in the two test flights attempted this year.

In Ottawa yesterday, Associate Defence Minister Harvie Andre faced demands from opposition parties in the House of Commons to cancel the agreement signed by the former Liberal government in 1983 allowing up to six cruise tests a year in Canada. He told MPs that the latest unarmed, unmanned missile apparently failed because its engine did not start when it was dropped from an aircraft, sending it plunging to a floe in the Beaufort Sea.

He dismissed warnings from critics of a potential danger to the public from the test flights, saying that the flight corridor is largely uninhabited, carefully monitored at all times and has "all kinds of safety mechanisms."

The Canadian Forces will make sure that nothing untoward happens, he told the Commons.

The minister also stressed that an investigation to determine the cause of yesterday's failure would be completed, with Canadian involvement, before another test flight is allowed. That procedure is part of the written test agreement, he said.

The first cruise test of the year came last month and ended with the missile falling short of its target in a crash instead of coming to rest, aided by a parachute, on a frozen lake. Military spokesmen said that it crashed because it ran out of fuel.

Yesterday, Mr. Andre stop short of giving New Democratic Party Leader Edward Broadbent the assurance he sought that all information from the investigation into the second crash would be made public.

"I'm not sure that we can find a way to make all of the information available and not, thereby, make it available to the adversaries of Canada," Mr. Andre said.

He said he would make as much information public as he could about the investigation.

"There will be no further tests until we determine the cause of this crash," Mr. Andre said. "Absolutely. That's part of the agreement. That's common sense. We're following a common sense procedure."

His explanation did not satisfy opposition parties. Liberal MP Jean Chrétien said the Government should cancel the test agreement until there is proof that the necessary safety guarantees have been met.

Although Mr. Chrétien was part of the government that approved the testing, he told the Commons that the Government should acknowledge that Canadians oppose the testing.

Mr. Broadbent said that, had the missile followed its designated route yesterday, it would have come within 24 kilometres of large towns. Had the guidance system failed then, instead of the engine, "people could actually be injured," the NDP Leader said.

Continued tests represent a "possible future danger, " he said.

Mr. Andre called the NDP Leader's comments about possible dangers "not totally responsible" and the fears "undue."

In Yellowknife, Nick Sibbeston, Government Leader of the Northwest Territories, issued a terse statement calling on Ottawa to halt cruise testing over the Beaufort Sea and Mackenzie Valley "until the safety of the people of the NWT and the protection of the fragile, northern environment can be guaranteed."

The Legislative Assembly said it was concerned about potential danger to communities near the misssile's flight path when it voted narrowly in 1983 to oppose the use of the North for the tests. "The crash today confirms that (those) fears are clearly justified," Mr. Sibbeston said.

Operation Dismantle, a peace group, which has long opposed cruise testing on grounds including possible accidents, also warned of potential danger in a statement it issued yesterday afternoon.

"We now have a 100 per cent failure rate for cruise missile tests in Canada for 1986 and a 50 per cent failure rate for all free-flight tests over Canada," said Dismantle executive officer John Wilkinson. "Fortunately, no one has been injured, but it is only a matter of time before a cruise missile crashes into an inhabited area. It is time for the Government of Canada to cancel any further cruise missile tests in Canada."

Mr. Wilkinson said it appears that the Government underestimated the danger of crashes in the test flights and asked how its assurances of safety could now be accepted.

Conservative MP Dave Nickerson, whose Western Arctic riding includes some of the test area, told reporters yesterday that he is satisfied with Mr. Andre's assurance that an investigation will determine the cause of the crash before another test goes ahead.

"I would want the assurance of the minister and I would be prepared to accept his assurance that things had been put right," Mr. Nickerson said. "But I wouldn't want, myself, to possess secrets of value to potential enemies ... I think that the word of both the minister of national defence and the associate minister of national defence can be taken at face value."

Military officials fear today's recovery efforts may be hampered by −47 degree temperatures and fog patches.

A team of U.S. and Canadian personnel arrived in Inuvik late yesterday to locate and recover the missile after it nose-dived 10,668 metres over the Beaufort Sea and crashed on an ice floe.

"It's engine apparently failed to start on launch this morning," said Capt. Richard Moore at the CFB Cold Lake.

Authorities would not give the exact site of the crash, saying only that the missile landed somewhere in the 150-kilometre-wide launch zone in the Beaufort Sea north of Inuvik.

A U.S. EC-135 Advanced Range Instrumentation Aircraft, which follows the cruise to monitor its progress during free-flight tests, spotted the missile's irregular fall immediately, Capt. Moore said. The missile normally makes its 2,500 km-long journey along the Mackenzie River corridor to Cold Lake.

In the past 10 years, almost 30 per cent of the cruise's 150 flight tests in the air, sea or ground have ended with malfunctions, said Cynthia Cannizzo, assistant director of the University of Calgary's Centre for Strategic Studies.

"Any sophisticated system is going to be down a certain number of times like the automatic teller machines at banks."

(Charlotte Montgomery is a reporter with the Globe's Ottawa bureau. Andrew Nikiforuk is a freelance writer based in Edmonton.)

/9317
CSO: 4220/31

RELATED ISSUES

CANADA: NEW DEFENSE BUDGET FIGURES REPORTED

Ottawa THE CITIZEN in English 28 Feb 86 p A5

[Text]

Maintaining some 7,185 Canadian flyers and soldiers in Europe will gobble up $100 million of the total $600-million projected increase in spending for the defence department in 1986-87, government estimates released Thursday show.

Meanwhile, costly modernization programs that proponents of a stronger military establishment have been clamoring for — new maritime helicopters, Aurora maritime patrol aircraft, six more frigates, diesel electric submarines, and more military reserves — were glaringly absent from the detailed estimates tabled in the Commons.

Also missing were any references to defence department funding measures backed by External Affairs Minister Joe Clark to assert Canadian sovereignty in the North, including a new Class-8 icebreaker, naval military exercises in the Arctic this year or a boost in funding for Inuit volunteers known as Rangers.

Finance Minister Michael Wilson's budget on Wednesday had spared defence and foreign aid from real cuts, but slowed the rate of growth in spending for both.

Wilson set defence spending at $9.9 billion in the 1986-87 fiscal year and $10.5 billion in 1987-88, up from $9.3 billion this year.

That will amount to a 2.75-per-cent increase in 1986-87 after inflation and two per cent the following year, down from an average three-per-cent growth rate for each of the last five years.

Defence Minister Erik Nielsen announced the hike in European forces last year to reassure Canada's North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies of the federal government's commitment to fulfilling its NATO role, even though critics have long contended that the Canadian troops could become human sacrifices to alliance solidarity in a Warsaw Pact attack on Western Europe.

The number of personnel in Europe is expected to increase to 7,185 in 1986-87 from an estimated 6,855 in 1985-86, when the government decided to beef up the NATO forces by an eventual 1,220.

The total number of Canadian Forces personnel is expected to increase to 84,492 from the 1985-86 estimate of 82,740.

Part of the increase will be offset by previously announced cuts of 1,069 civilian jobs.

An estimated $542 million will be spent for personnel and operations in Europe and another $481.7 million on capital projects — $100 million more than the 1985-86 forecast.

Canada maintains a mechanized brigade and a fighter air group equipped with CF-18 Hornet aircraft in West Germany.

Brian MacDonald, executive director of the Canadian Institute of Strategic Studies in Toronto, said the defence estimates show "we're paying for decisions that were made a long time ago, but not really putting any new things in the pot.

"The Canadian military, of course, will take whatever it gets and do as it's told, but as far as addressing the ongoing modernization of the Canadian forces it doesn't do a damn thing except for pay for things that have already been in place.

"It's a very stand-pat defence budget."

As for the politics of the budget, MacDonald said the minimal spending increases represent a "massive backing away" from the Conservatives' 1984 election campaign promise of six-per-cent real growth in defence spending to make up for years of Liberal neglect.

Dan Middlemiss, a professor of strategic studies at Dalhousie University in Halifax, said the budget suggests defence planners will have to cut back on operations and training to sustain capital expenditures.

The estimates predict that 25 per cent of total defence spending in 1986-87 will go for capital projects.

Middlemiss forecast that the spending restraint will eventually lead to "some difficult trade-offs" among the Forces' roles in Canadian, North American and European defence as well as international peacekeeping.

The defence department's financial bind was evident in the cost list of some of the projects now under way — $625 million for six patrol frigates already under construction, $546.6 million for 37 more CF-18 fighter aircraft, $81.4 million for air-to-air missiles for the CF-18, $57.6 million for new rifles and sub-machineguns, $39 million for the acquisition of Dash 8 aircraft, and $15.6 million to extend the life of aging destroyers to maintain the would-be warships in 'safe-to-go-to-sea" condition.

/9317
CSO: 5220/31

END